





BR 145 .S6 1907  
Schubert, Hans von, 1859-  
1931.  
Outlines of church history









THEOLOGICAL TRANSLATION LIBRARY

VOL. XXIV

H. VON SCHUBERT'S CHURCH HISTORY





# OUTLINES OF CHURCH HISTORY

BY  
HANS VON SCHUBERT

PROFESSOR ORD. OF CHURCH HISTORY AT HEIDELBERG

*TRANSLATED FROM THE THIRD GERMAN EDITION*

BY

MAURICE A. CANNEY, M.A.

*WITH A SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER BY*

MISS ALICE GARDNER

NEWNHAM COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

NEW YORK: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

LONDON: WILLIAMS AND NORGATE

1907



## PREFACE

By publishing my Lectures on Church History ("Grundzüge der Kirchengeschichte"), which I first delivered once a week as a public course for members of all faculties in the winter 1896-97, and afterwards, in approximately their present enlarged form, on many occasions, to theologians twice a week, I hope that I am meeting a more general demand, particularly among theologians. The need of an historical education for all who would take part in the organising of the Church hardly needs, in these days, to be pointed out. And yet how many succumb to the task of working their way through a forest of facts and problems; how often is disgust the only result, in the case even of gifted students and clergymen! Non-theologians easily underestimate the magnitude of the work required of theologians alone in the field of Church History, when they have not only to survey a development of two millenniums and of a rich and delicate ramification extending into every sphere of thought and life, but also to penetrate it and submit it to their criticism. In my essay on "The Present Conception and Treatment of Church History," to which I may refer for my own standpoint, I have

spoken (pp. 2 ff.) at greater length of the difficulties and tasks of the present situation. Neander lectured on "sciography." How far since then our young students have been provided with a similar help is not within my knowledge, but experience has taught me that they are uncommonly grateful for a concise summary of the whole material, aiming at giving the essential facts, and for a guide to the red threads in the too variegated web of history. To the wish, often expressed in this quarter, that the Lectures might appear in print, was joined that of my publisher (Dr Siebeck), who felt himself less able to dispense with a readable review of the whole material, because his two larger undertakings involved in the "Outlines" (the *Grundriss* of Karl Müller of Tübingen) and the "Handbook" (*Lehrbuch*, by the present writer) naturally make slow progress. To these considerations was added, next, a very gratifying experience which I had when, on the occasion of the third vacation course at Kiel University in 1901, I put the material, condensed into twelve lectures, before a large audience of teachers. The interest shown in the subject and the desire for publication were so keen that I may be allowed to think that in printing the Lectures a still wider circle of teachers will be benefited. Finally, the hope was present that I might also find readers amongst those educated laymen who, though not obliged professionally to devote attention to what is in part tough matter, would be glad to be brought to realise in a brief way how the course of development in the Church, the

history of the Gospel, presents itself to a representative of the science, acquainted with the present position of research. In view of this, I have revised the whole.

H. v. SCHUBERT.

KIEL, *September* 1903.

---

In the present edition, which is the third, I have not introduced any far-reaching changes. Nevertheless, apart from improvements in form, I have in many places made slight corrections in the matter, and in my concluding sketch (Ch. XVI.) I have noted, at least, the most important of new movements. I hold fast to the "optimism" of the general verdict, in spite of the seriousness of the present situation.

H. v. S.

KIEL, *June* 1906.



# CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. THE PRECONDITIONS . . . . .	1
II. EARLY CHRISTIANITY . . . . .	22
III. RISE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH . . . . .	42
IV. CHRISTIANITY AND THE ROMAN STATE . . . . .	70
V. FAITH, THEOLOGY, AND DOGMA . . . . .	88
VI. MORALITY, DISCIPLINE, AND MONASTICISM . . . . .	106
VII. WORSHIP; CULTUS-RELIGION; THE MASS . . . . .	124
VIII. ALTERED STATE OF THE WORLD; BYZANTIUM AND THE WEST . . . . .	139
IX. RISE OF THE ROMAN MONARCHY IN THE CHURCH OF THE WEST . . . . .	158
X. THE GERMANIC TERRITORIAL (NATIONAL, IMPERIAL) CHURCHES . . . . .	172
XI. IMPERIUM AND SACERDOTIUM FROM CHARLES THE GREAT TO INNOCENT III. . . . .	187
XII. SPIRITUAL LIFE IN THE CHURCH OF THE MIDDLE AGE . . . . .	204
XIII. THE DISRUPTION OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND DAWN OF A NEW AGE . . . . .	227

XIV. END OF THE UNION OF THE CHURCHES OF THE WEST, AND THE FORMATION OF CONFESSION-CHURCHES, AS A RESULT OF REFORMATION AND COUNTER-REFORMATION . . . . .	2
XV. VICTORIOUS PROGRESS OF PROTESTANT SUBJECTIVISM. PIETISM AND ENLIGHTENMENT . . . . .	27
XVI. RELIGIOUS AND ECCLESIASTICAL REGENERATION, AND THE STRUGGLE OF OPPOSING TENDENCIES IN RECENT TIMES . . . . .	30
SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER ON RELIGIOUS THOUGHT AND LIFE IN ENGLAND DURING THE NINETEENTH CENTURY . . . . .	34
INDEX OF NAMES . . . . .	37
INDEX OF SUBJECTS . . . . .	38



# OUTLINES OF CHURCH HISTORY

## I

### THE PRECONDITIONS

PAUL'S account of the origin of Christianity is that "the time was fulfilled" (Gal. iv. 4). The passage is a *locus classicus* in which the truth is emphasized that a religious view, which is concerned with divine purposes, does not exclude the historical standpoint from which events are investigated as regards their causes and conditions. Indeed, we cannot properly appreciate the wisdom of God's guidance until we realize in how many ways the gospel formed a link in a chain, to what an extent the growth of a universal religion had been prepared by the conditions of the age. When we do realize this, we marvel at the way in which God so regulates men and things that the right event takes place at the right moment.

The humble birthplace of the "Son of Man," as Jesus called Himself, was situated in a remote and despised part of that empire which claimed to be "the inhabited earth" and to include all mankind. Nor was the claim as extravagant as it appears to

be, for in the days when Christianity was still in its apostolic age, in the century from Augustus to Trajan and Hadrian, the sway of Rome had extended to its widest limits. The Mediterranean kingdom encroached upon the wild and dark regions of the north and the interior of Europe, into the deserts of Africa where dwelt men, if men they could be called, with no heads and whose eyes were in their breast (cp. the stories of Pomponius Mela); and far away to the seats of the oldest civilization on the Tigris and Euphrates, the wonderland of the East gradually revealed itself. Even India, that hot, enervating country whose name still possessed a magic charm, was ready to send its treasures on camels' backs, over hills and deserts, to the pampered lords of the world, who were ever ready to welcome anything new. Peace reigned everywhere save where an Iranian people, the warlike Parthian mountaineers, troubled the frontier. These, however, like the Germanic inhabitants of the north, were held in check by a strong force of soldiers.

The Macedonian Empire, which had itself supplanted the older empires and had produced a Hellenism of a Greek and Oriental blend, had now itself been swallowed up and incorporated in the Roman world. Thus we speak of the Græco-Roman Empire. Not quite correctly, however, since the political *union* was formed by the fusion of three main types—the Roman, the Greek, and the Oriental, of which the Greek and Roman were the more closely related by nature, though the Greek and Oriental had already formed a close union.

To preserve this union something more was needed,

and, first, a unified system of communications. We still admire the straight, paved Roman roads in the Alps or in the countrysides of France. It needed, secondly, a union in the army which marched along these roads to bind an iron girdle ever more firmly round the empire. An old legend even tells us that the centurion who stood by the cross of Jesus was a German; and in the encampments on the banks of the Rhine it was not unusual to hear Syriac spoken. It entailed, thirdly, a union of official language. It will be remembered that the inscription on the cross at Golgotha was in Latin as well as in Greek and Hebrew. And wherever Roman government and commerce spread, Roman law, which has always been Rome's pride, went with them. Intellectual union was bound to make rapid progress. The Greek nature, being intermediate between the Roman-Occidental and the Oriental, related by blood to the one, newly wedded to the other, provided a natural medium for a union of culture. The products of the Greeks' wonderful intellect, their philosophy, mythology, art and language, had become the common inheritance of mankind. The Greek language was predominant in the Christian Church at Rome down to the beginning of the third century.

The whole of this vast empire was at rest after the storms of a century of revolution, which in fact lasted from the time of the Gracchi to the days of Cæsar and Octavian, secure in the hands of the *Imperium* itself which, sprung as it was from the army, by treating with wise consideration the old forms dear to citizens of a republic, had fully adapted itself to the needs of the age. The home in which

the human race might dwell in peace seemed to be prepared and ready.

And yet it would be misleading to lay too great stress on the idea of unity and universalism. For notwithstanding what we have said, the empire was as far still from being anything more than a *mingling of peoples* as the Danubian State of Austria-Hungary is from representing an ethnographical union—that is, it was a really united state only in a geographical sense. A traveller in Rome would not only be overwhelmed with the impression of complete and general unity; he would be equally conscious that he had before him in the eternal city something resembling a “cosmopolitan hotel,” as one has described it, or, as another has put it, a motley “epitome of the whole world”; nor must we forget, if we would rightly understand the history of the ancient Church, that the Roman-Occidental and Græco-Oriental minds never ceased to be different, and that, however many the crossings and assimilations may have been, certain types were perpetuated within the two great divisions. There were three main types in East and West alike: in the West, the Italian, the Celtic, which extended over Gaul, Spain, and Britain, and the North African Punic-Numidian; in the East, the Greek, Syrian, and Egyptian.

Nor is the political union of the empire to be understood as a mere levelling process. To be a Roman citizen and to be a subject of the empire did not mean the same thing until the days of the Emperor Caracalla (212). For administrative purposes the empire was for centuries a very complicated organism, in which there were a number of degrees of

dependence or independence. It took a long time for Rome, as a city state, with its sovereign popular assembly the Comitia, and the whole system of associated communities, "allies," "friends" (*municipia, fœderati, socii, amici*), to develop a uniform despotism such as the Orient was familiar with. Even when it became necessary, as it did at first, for the emperor to share with the holy city, *urbs Roma*, the worship of the world, even then the *populus Romanus*, on through the Middle Ages, and after it had long ceased to be anything more than the populace of Rome, never forgot that originally it had been called to rule the world and to make emperors.

The diversity of interests by which the several portions of the empire—provinces and districts, town and country, cosmopolitan capital and barbaric hinterland—were actuated, and the consideration with which these special interests were met, explain so much that seems strange in the history of the persecutions, controversies, and constitution of the early—nay, the earliest—Church. In general, down to the time of the emperor Constantine, when the hand of a single ruler seized the helm of church and state alike, one of the chief dangers that beset the student is that of hasty generalizations. Even afterwards a number of disintegrating tendencies lived on, which ultimately, in new and more favourable circumstances, proved victorious.

The Roman empire is thus politically a skilful compromise between the forces that made for unity and diversity. And if we inquire what was the state of *religion* when Christianity presented itself to the

motley throng included in the empire, we are met by the same contrast—an inevitable one, because it was in a very real sense as much a political as a religious question. What do we find, then, as regards religion? We find a struggle between polytheistic and monotheistic tendencies.

In the ancient world *Religion and State* could not be separated. It is the duty of the citizen to worship the gods who protect the sacred hearth of the state. Polytheism is an inseparable feature of the political and national character of this religion: one state, one group of cults. When several states became one, the gods were added, and in part blended; whenever the Romans gained a victory, the Roman state took into its wide fold the deities of the conquered people, as well as the people itself, thus of its own accord producing an official syncretism or mingling of religions. It combined the kindred cults of Greece with its own, and freely admitted even the Oriental religions into the capital itself. The result was a great increase in the crowd of gods; but at the same time the opposite movement towards unity and centralization in the cultus, as in other matters, was equally natural and inevitable, since wherever the state extended its rule it compelled people to recognize its own victorious gods.

Wherever Rome's legions carried the Roman eagle, Jupiter Capitolinus, the father of the gods, whom it represented, to whom Hadrian erected a temple on the site of the Jewish sanctuary, and after whom he called the city of David *Ælia Capitolina*, went with it. But the empire had, in addition, a new religion of its own in the worship of the genius of the

emperor, who together with Dea Roma represented the glory and perfection of a unified state. This shows clearly the desire to set one of the many gods of the nations above the rest as the one new god for all, and to make monotheism the ideal instead of polytheism, though it is equally evident that for the first time such ideas were associated entirely with politics and the present life; people were commanded to worship the state in the person of its highest representative.

The universal state whose ultimate aim was to embrace all peoples and give to all individuals the same ruler naturally needed a religion which would appeal to the human race collectively and individually; in other words, it had a natural craving for Christianity. In the end the cult of the emperor in Rome was really to give place to the worship of the King in heaven, but this could not happen until men's *views of religion* in every class of society had been revolutionized, and what Paul says about the time being fulfilled can be held to be true especially in this connection.

To say that the pagan religions had fallen to pieces is not true. It is a popular delusion to suppose that when Christianity came the pagan peoples had lost their piety, and that henceforth the world, which had been consumed by doubts and was struggling with Pilate's question, presented, as it were, a blank page which was waiting to be inscribed with the glad tidings. If the shipwrecked sailor is to be saved, he must at least have enough strength to hold a rope when it is thrown to him. No; there is far more that calls for explanation than

is commonly supposed. The problem with which we are concerned, that of the origin of the Catholic Church, can never be solved unless we take careful note of certain very active and positive forces. When we dealt with the political side of the religious question, we found a current running to meet Christianity, but also another running in an opposite direction. We find a similar state of things when we come to ask what ideas men in general had of religion.

The converging currents were very powerful. This is one of the most important and certain of our new discoveries. There are some striking examples. Christians felt Seneca, Nero's tutor, to be so like a Christian that they invented a correspondence between him and Paul; and Jerome included him amongst Christian writers. Epictetus, at the end of the first century, surprises us with the maxim: "If you wish to be good, be assured first that you are bad." Plutarch (*† c.* 125) declared that of all men atheists are the most unhappy. To say that ancient philosophy ended in scepticism and Epicureanism, that is to say, in materialism and infidelity, is not the whole truth; it is to ignore the Stoa, Plato, and Pythagoras. But the time of great systems is indeed past. The ruling Roman nation is not speculative, it is practical; and philosophy, overpowered by this practical spirit of the West, becomes itself practical and so religious. The Greeks introduced a new and flourishing era of "Sophistry," in which philosophy and rhetoric were united, but it was essentially of a formal nature. But this process of mingling different systems produces an average philosophy which in nobler minds is



thoroughly idealistic, and in the noblest minds quite religious. As often happens, the critical trend of philosophical scepticism actually comes to minister to religious needs. In the first and second centuries we already witness the rise of a philosophy of revelation which in the third century was known as Neoplatonism, and which represents the idealism in which the philosophical development of the ancient world culminated. The popular philosophy of the educated classes and their leaders undoubtedly exhibits a leaning to monotheism and a decided fondness for moralizing. There is absolutely nothing political or national about it; it is individualistic, and appeals to the common sense of people in general. Is not this a current flowing towards Christianity?

At a later date pagans themselves were supposed to furnish prophecies of Christ, proofs of the universal application of Christianity, rational grounds, a natural theology as a foundation of the revealed.

Indeed, there was so much life left in pagan religion that where currents of this kind did not merge into Christianity, rivals might arise of such force and significance as Neoplatonism, which in Porphyry, the pupil of its master, Plotinus († 269), became at a critical period the most dangerous foe to Christians.

When we turn from the philosophers, the men of culture, to the uncultured class, we find a similar state of things in the sphere of the life of the soul. Here, again, there seems at first to be unhealthy disquiet and demoralization, a hurried and eager search for new cults—and nothing more. People have lost faith in the old forms of religion, and here, too, the refining process has entered.

But there is another side to the picture. In the first place, it is surely quite clear that this eager search for something new shows that religious needs have not ceased to exist, but are seeking satisfaction in new forms. They are really more pressing than ever. The countries of the West are captivated by the ancient cults that come to them from the fairy-land of the gorgeous East, and are powerless to resist the religions of light which bring from the real Orient such grand and fantastic myths about the origin of worlds and gods. This is not to be considered mere retrogression in comparison with the sober ceremonial piety of the Romans. In particular, the rites in the worship of the mysteries, current among Hellenes, intermingled as they were with Oriental elements, cults relating entirely to another world, gain fresh strength; the problem of the soul and its continued existence, the question of the future reward or punishment of individuals, begin to receive more and more attention.

And, in the second place, when cults mingle, as these have done, higher and purer forms may be evolved. One example will suffice — the Mithras cult. Pompey already found it in Cilicia, on its way to the West. It owes its importance to the fact that it combined the Greek belief in immortality with the Persian doctrine of Light. The Hellene's hope of another life, which was no more than a shadowy existence in Hades, is lifted to heaven and associated with the sun and life in Light. The magian Apollonius of Tyana, who lived through the whole of the apostolic age, evidently cherished the idea of a reform of pagan cultus. Subsequently,

at the beginning of the third century, he is given the character of a pagan Messiah, and it is a matter of dispute whether, as Baur and Zeller think, he was meant to be a direct counterpart of Christ, or whether the likeness was developed quite unconsciously. Most modern scholars, including the present writer, consider that the latter view has been shown to be correct. And if this be so, we have another remarkable instance of converging currents. However uncertain may be the extent to which the ideal figure of Apollonius is based upon historical facts, there is evidence enough to prove that he suggested extensive and practical reforms in pagan cultus under the Julian and Flavian emperors. He was a Neopythagorean: in order to become really and truly practical, philosophy must descend from its throne and enter into the religious life of the people. Purer thinking was promoted when to "syncretism" was added the elevating and saving thought that all the different forms of cultus are simply radiations of the single Deity who dwells above the stars, the one Ineffable. Even Augustus brought many of the gods under one vaulted roof in the Pantheon at Rome. In this way philosophy is infused into the religion of the masses, and serves to refine it, to strengthen the tendency towards monotheism and the feeling for morality, purity, and godly life, and to promote at the same time individualism in religion.

This means not merely a mingling and adjustment of philosophies, and even of religions; it means also a reconciliation, a union of philosophy with religion. The cult of the Mysteries, in which higher knowledge,

*Gnosis*, is gradually revealed to those who have been solemnly initiated, in proportion to their moral progress, revealed, not in cold maxims of doctrine, but in a glimpse from this life into the world of rewards and punishments beyond, so vivid that in feeling and imagination the worshipper is there already—a community of believers and yet withal a school of those who know—this on the one side, and philosophy on the other, both struggling towards one another: philosophy which, by having grown practical and craving a revelation, helps to promote the cause of religion and converts the school of worldly wisdom into a community of worshippers of God! Did not both of them at the same time struggle towards Christianity? Surely this was a way in which the time was fulfilled! And yet Christianity would seem—would it not?—to have been exposed to the danger, which was well-nigh unavoidable, of being drawn into this great reconciliation, so as to become adjusted like other cults, and deprived of characteristic features.

The Discourses of Epictetus suggest another question. Was there really any need for the gospel? Would not paganism of itself have developed an equally sublime form of spiritual life? If it was wrong to underestimate the currents which were preparing the way for Christianity, it would be still more so to suppose that these could have produced anything equal to it. It is only necessary to point to the darker side of the picture. In his "History of Christian Philanthropy," Uhlhorn has described the whole of this pagan world as "a world devoid of love"; and even though his words are somewhat of an

exaggeration, they are not altogether unjustified. In the moral teaching of pagan philosophies and religions it is hard to find any clear principle of love, especially of that compassionate love, without respect of persons, which springs from a humble and self-sacrificing spirit; as hard as it is to discover in the humanitarian institutions founded by society and the state in imperial times any evidence of that power that impels people to devote themselves to a social life founded upon brotherly love. For instance, this is how Apollonius prays: "Send me, O Helios, over the earth wherever it pleases thee, and let me find good, but let me not experience evil." The highest practical wisdom of the idealists of those days consisted in a negative and aristocratic system of ethics; in introspection and retirement from the world, the road to which was asceticism, and the goal to which they led passionless repose. And as to their monotheism—in its effort to become popular and religious, and yet at the same time to pose as the guardian of the polytheism of the mob, it lost all clearness; its god is not the only God, but the greatest deity, the highest point, as it were, in a pyramid of divine beings whose authority, nevertheless, is always threatened by the vague idea that there may be another last principle at the root of the evil world; while He Himself is rather an abstract principle, an original force or substance, than a moral personality. We cannot be sure of anything; there are more postulates and hypotheses than certainties; though there may be inklings of some, there are no general convictions. Finally, there is no firm and abiding connection between ethics on the one hand and

monotheism on the other. Even Epictetus has not advanced beyond the idea that self-redemption is possible as the result of virtue and knowledge; God is still far away, that mysterious power of fate with whom it is impossible to make an eternal covenant, that sublime Being who is of such a nature that any contact with the world would defile Him, and who is said by the master Plotinus to have deigned to hold communion with him only four times in six years.

The Græco-Roman world, in spite of all its glitter and glory, is forced to receive the gift of the gospel from what the bitter anti-Semite Tacitus has called the *tæterrima gens*, from the "foulest nation" within the wide compass of the Roman empire, from the Jews in the remote Syrian region. These already had the advantage over all other peoples, in being the classical people of religion.

So many people had a more or less distinct craving for an ethical monotheism, and here *was* one already in existence. In late Judaism there was a religious activity which closely associated itself with the religion of the prophets. Of this there is evidence not merely in the period of the revival and the national struggles under the Maccabees. The period of political decline had itself led people to look within themselves, had spiritualized their hopes, and developed a ripe individualism. Here, too, the fate of the individual soul becomes a matter of supreme interest, and thoughts and visions of a personal resurrection in which men will be rewarded or punished and will live in an eternal kingdom where the Son of man sits in judgment, become current.

But there is a rent in their soul, as there is in their history.

At the present time the Jewish race still presents a striking contrast. The Jew is clever, pliant, pushing, sometimes cringing, a born trader, and yet ever a Jew, in whose eyes we Europeans are the despised *Gōyim*, the Gentiles. The Jews of the time of Christ present exactly the same contrast. How largely the history of Israel is the history of a rigid Pharisaism, how truly the Law and the apocalyptic Messianic hope may be said to be the two guiding stars in Jewish life and thought, is well known. Yet at the very time when the fatal struggle with the Romans, which had gradually been brought on by Jewish exclusiveness and national pride, was in process, Jews were living dispersed throughout the empire, large as it was, busily engaged in bartering not only merchandise, but spiritual goods as well—in Alexandria numbering a third part of the population, in Rome spreading from their own quarter on the other side of the Tiber over the whole city, in Antioch, Asia Minor, Greece, everywhere; they formed, in fact, a true “international” even in those days. The first trait, exclusiveness, made it the one people in the East that could withstand the levelling process of Hellenism; faithful to its religion and history, it gathers up this history, so uniquely religious, and preserves it in a sacred canon for the edification of the community of believers. In clinging with such tenacity to its religion, and unconsciously saving this material for the use of its daughter-religion Christianity, it was preparing its own doom. Its second trait, pride, prompted it to dig

channels everywhere, which carried its one valuable treasure—that of its experience, knowledge, and venerable traditions—to every part of the Græco-Roman world.

These two facts must be borne in mind as being closely related. In the land of Palestine, in closest sympathy with the soul of His people, Jesus arose, as the fruit grows out of the blossom. He studied its sacred books, loved its national heroes, knew by heart the words of the prophets and the psalmists, and thus by degrees came to realize that He was Himself the Messiah. It is a fact of the utmost importance that the Christian religion grew up historically, as a history of salvation, in this organic way, out of the grand historical life of a single people, taking over from it the book containing its history—a people's book which has no equal. The Jews of the diaspora had their Bible in a Greek translation, Greek being very widely spoken. When, therefore, they handed over to the world, as it were, this ancient book, they were supplying that very ethical monotheism that was so much desired; and it came as a truth which had stood the test of time, was rooted in history, demonstrated by God's work among mankind, and so as truth revealed, or, in other words, as religious conviction.

Here it is evident that before the time of Christ the converging currents must already have met and brought the religious ideas which had sprung up amongst Jews and pagans into closer contact, and even have fused them together.

The Jews were hated and despised, and were exposed to popular attacks which often ended in bloodshed. How great this contempt was is



shown by the most grotesque slanders; and yet everywhere throughout the diaspora an increasing number of worshippers attached themselves to the Jewish synagogues. In addition to those who accepted the law of Moses, without being included in the Jewish race, there was a large class who were only loosely connected with the synagogues, having taken over from them certain fundamental ideas. On the other hand, the Jews of the Dispersion refused to abandon their nationality, even though they spoke Greek and were "Hellenists." Even Philo the philosopher, when his people were tormented at Rome in the days of Caligula, put himself at the head of a deputation which asked that the rights of the Jews might be respected; he was content to remain a Jew. It is true that propaganda and apologetics were undertaken on behalf of the Jews. But how was Judaism affected by this missionary work and by this defence of its claims? By emphasizing those doctrines of which pagans already had an apprehension or at least a vague glimmering, by then mastering their idealistic philosophy in order to beat them with their own weapons and so allure them to their own ground, they were breaking down those national barriers of Judaism on behalf of which Jews were soon afterwards ready to die in their own land. When Philo the Jew, in a work on the Mosaic Book of Origins, talks of cosmopolitanism, his words have a different bearing and significance from those of Seneca the Stoic philosopher, when he speaks of a kingdom of God and of a citizenship of the world. For the Jewish philosopher was associated with an ethical monotheism in the form of an historical religion and

of a body of wisdom from the Orient, which was the most ancient known to men. Compared with the Hebrew sages, the great poets and thinkers among the Greeks, Hesiod and Homer, Heraclitus and Plato, were in his eyes novices, whose best thoughts were borrowed. There was proof enough of this in the sacred records, if only they were rightly understood; that is to say, if, where necessary, their real spiritual meaning were brought out by means of allegorical explanation. Here Rabbinic and Stoic exegesis proved helpful. Thus those who were not Jews could be taught to read the Old Testament without taking offence, since they were allowed to pass over what was purely Jewish, temporal, and local, and to read it simply as the book of humanity which contains in the first chapters, and in the form of an allegory, a universal and eternal ethic and psychology.

It is obvious that on this ground, where an enlightened and liberal Judaism, Alexandrian in character, idealistic in aim, and a paganism which was morally inclined, met together, the soil was well prepared for the planting of a universal religion. Here, especially, is it true that the time was fulfilled. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that the holy book which was ultimately made to support all sorts of claims, pointed beyond itself to a promised time of fulfilment and a Messiah who was to introduce it. The religion which was here offered to men lived on a hope for the future as much as on the glory of the past; it was both old and young at the same time; it made great promises, nay, it promised all things. When hope was afterwards converted into reality, the new elements could be organically con-

nected with the old, the fulfilment with the promise, and all the glory of the past transferred to the new development.

These ideas, to which witness was borne in the Jewish records, must have found their way even amongst those people who kept aloof from the synagogue. Tacitus tells us in his *Histories* (v. 13) that the report that there was a passage in the ancient books which said that the Orient would rise up and, starting from Judæa, would overcome the world, was in wide circulation.

As a result, then, of our inquiry into the preconditions under which Christianity arose, we have found that the source was in the Holy Land, the sea into which the flood was to flow was the Roman world-empire, the watercourses by which it was brought there were the Jewish diaspora. But we have already reason to suspect that even as it made its way along these channels, the original element was unable to preserve its native purity. It has been rightly observed that even before Christ, when a synthesis was formed of Hellenistic and Judaic elements, a decision was already made as to the development of Christianity. Stated in the form of a paradox, it comes to this: the historian of Catholic Christianity must start with the Greek Jew Philo. Support may be found for this in the fact that the earliest writer on Catholic development, Eusebius of Cæsarea, regards Philo as one of the first Christian Fathers, and includes him among the original sources of the Christian religion. Further, the synthesis we have spoken of not only provided forms, nor did it merely break down the national

barriers of the Jewish religion, and by so doing to some extent change its nature; it also, at least in the person of such eminent exponents as Philo, drew Judaism into that syncretistic process which was at work all over the world, and, as the Christian religion travelled the same road, clouded its nature from its very infancy. Here, again, there was first an interchange of philosophic ideas; Platonic and Stoic elements were combined with the speculations of Jewish rabbis. Secondly, we find an interchange of religious experiences and ideals of piety. Into the piety of the Jews, which was by nature of an active and moral character, is introduced the Greek ideal—based upon their dualistic conception of God and their æsthetic temperament—of a worship which consists of avoiding the world and finding satisfaction in negative morality, and of communion with God in a state of mystical ecstasy. The work, *On the Contemplative Life*, which is associated with the name of Philo, has been considered to be of uncertain origin. It may have been written by some Christian monk in support of his own mode of life. But it is now again more generally ascribed to Philo. In any case, it has been shown that there is a close connection between Philo and the Christian monks, and monasticism was a special product of the Catholic spirit. Thirdly and lastly, we have an interchange of ideas between philosophy and religion, and to the philosophy of religion is assigned the highest place. At the same time history itself, as the subject matter or content of religion, is pushed into the background, and that baneful confusion of religion with theological speculations, and of a life in God

with a knowledge of God, now comes into vogue. Eusebius of Cæsarea, the disciple of Origen, had good reason for his high appreciation of Philo. And if we are nowadays anxious to solve this problem, we try to escape from the spirit of Philo which hovers over the Christian Church in the days of its early growth.

## II

### EARLY CHRISTIANITY

AT the head of the seventeenth book of his *Philosophy of the History of Man*, in which he has arrived at a point where it is necessary to deal with the Christian period, Herder places this sentence: "I bow my head in awe before Thy noble image, Thou head and founder of a kingdom having such high ends, such enduring and vast dominion, such simple vital principles, such powerful motives that this earthly sphere of life seemed too narrow for it. . . . Let Thy calm figure stand alone in front of all the history which takes its rise in Thee." The calm figure is not made to speak; Herder proceeds at once to deal with His work and its effects. We can fully associate ourselves with the sentiment of the poet who in these words speaks as a Christian philosopher, without removing from this work the Founder of our historical religion, the historical cause of the mighty effects of Christianity.

Christianity was not solely the result of the pre-conditions we have noted above. The history of mankind is not the same as the history of Nature. Personalities such as we have to deal with, endowed as they are with self-consciousness and self-determina-

tion, cannot be regarded merely as the products of circumstances, or explained and calculated like a mathematical problem. The fact is, that in the web of inevitable and intelligible combinations we are continually coming upon a woof of human originality which puzzles and baffles us at every point. The greater the personality is, the more are we impelled to inquire how far it gathers up the forces of the age, and at the same time how far its own mysterious genius, lifting it above ordinary people, giving it finer organs by which to pierce a little farther than others into the essence of things, enables it to say something new and so to leave its mark on the world of its own age and of ages to come. The *prophets* were religious geniuses; their ethical and religious strength of character introduced them to new experiences, supplied them with new facts with regard to the relations in which the individual stands to the first personal cause. They therefore claimed, as they felt obliged to do, that their sentences and postulates were absolutely valid and binding. They resembled the philosophers in applying their minds to the highest things in all their bearings; they differed from them in reaching their results immediately by spiritual intuition, and not by logical abstraction. Thus while the philosophers only meditated on God, the world, and mankind, and established a theoretical relationship between them, the prophets gained something practical, a living communion with the object of all knowledge, which could not fail to become a positive impulse to action, a force compelling them to model their own lives, as well as the lives of others, in accordance with their

new knowledge. Not very long ago we used to be told that Jesus of Nazareth had the merit of being the greatest of the prophets. He was certainly this, in addition to what He was besides. All the characteristics we have mentioned were present in Him in the highest degree; His Jewish contemporaries regarded the Rabbi of Galilee as a prophet, and Christian dogma has always laid stress on His prophetic office. And this reminder may not be quite unnecessary at a time when in one quarter and another an idea, which is correct enough in itself, is in danger of being exaggerated in so unpsychological a way that original ideas in religion could no longer be ascribed to Jesus, and He Himself might be represented as one of the epigones of late Judaism.

But the fact of vital importance has still to be noticed; the definition is still incomplete. The theology of recent years, which only the ignorant and unintelligent can compare with the rationalism of a century ago, has most emphatically taught us to grasp the one great reality of the Person of Christ:— that He came not merely in the character of a prophet who proclaimed the will of God in a supremely powerful and impressive way, so that in virtue of the fresh knowledge men could go forward with firmer steps through life's maze, but also in the character of the Lord, who, having first appealed to men's conscience and touched their hearts, brought them to their knees when they desired to be His obedient followers; and finally, in the character of one in whose image, in which greatness and humility, sublime self-consciousness and self-denying compassion, were so incomparably mingled, men caught a glimpse of the



hidden face of God, so that in knowing Him they knew God. "None knoweth the Son save the Father, nor the Father save the Son." When Jesus, applying an Old Testament idea, for which parallels exist among the pagans, called Himself the Son of God, forgave sins, and had power to remove distress, He stood apart from the crowd in the immediate neighbourhood of God; when, on the other hand, He made His dignity rest on the purest humanity, He brought God everlasting near to weak and sinful men to pardon them as a father pardons his children. In the character of the prophet His disciples came to find a revelation of God Himself; the prophet became the *Lord and King* who ruled their lives. It was then that the fullest meaning was attached to His moral precepts; the kingdom in which the will of His Father is done is *His* kingdom, and those who would enter this kingdom must give up their lives to its Lord, who in return will allow them to share in His life of power and dominion. This implies the foundation, not of a school, but of a life in common which may be compared with that of the family, Jesus being the head or father of the house, and the disciples, through Him, citizens of the kingdom and members of the household of God. To regulate their new life, He made rules adapted to a kingdom of a moral order, a real sermon of the mount, breathing the air of the hills, the noblest moral maxims known to us, and taught them the principles of a sane communion with God in the Lord's Prayer, which, prayer and creed in one, possesses a truly œcumenical character. In thus giving meaning and purpose to their lives, His faith was with them converted into faith in Him.

There is still more to add. The Jews, generally, lived in expectation of the kingdom; the cry "The kingdom is at hand" had made the public appearance of John the Baptist very effective. Jesus is convinced that it *is* in process of coming, *has* already dawned; His conviction is supported by the belief that the overthrow of the forces hostile to God, which will be complete at the great day, is now beginning—yet the hostile forces triumph in the end. All His precepts were meant to prepare and educate His disciples for their entry into the kingdom of heaven: whosoever will enter thereinto, must do the will of My Father in heaven. And yet this same will of the Father, it was evident, led Jesus Himself, the inaugurator of the kingdom, to suffering instead of to victory, and in the end it was His mission alone that proved to be His greatest gift to humanity, the new truth. This suggests a third line of thought. Although, so far as we know, Jesus seldom quoted the greatest of the Old Testament prophets, the second Isaiah, the prophet of the exile, yet the course of His life and its explanation must have brought Him into deep and natural harmony with this prophet. The figure of the Servant of the Lord who suffers for his own people or for all peoples (Wellhausen), that God may accept his suffering in expiation of the sins of all and show mercy upon all, is certainly (in the opinion of the present writer) the profoundest touch in the ancient Israelite scheme of salvation to be found anywhere in the Old Testament; though it is not quite without parallel in the pagan Greek religion, "for," says Œdipus in Colonus (i. 5), "one soul could make atonement for the world if, impelled by a pure

love, it gave itself up for the world." But this very touch was altogether absent from the picture of the Messiah in the time of Jesus. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that in Jesus the idea of a freewill offering "for the redemption of many" was realized, and this not only by the mere fact of His crucifixion, which, when the agony of Gethsemane was past, He did not seek to avoid; He deliberately took up the idea, and gave peculiar expression to it at the Last Supper, connecting His approaching death with the covenant-sacrifice of the Old Testament, as a better, a perfect sacrifice, a freewill offering of the Son of Man made out of love for His brethren, whom God will forgive and be reconciled with, if they show gratitude and love in return for the overwhelming love first shown to them and enter into communion with the Lord who was faithful even unto death. He who was both prophet and king becomes priest also, the true *High Priest*, who enters the sanctuary but once—to sacrifice Himself.

There is thus a conflict of ideas. The arrest abruptly terminates the work of establishing the kingdom; the shameful death of a slave on the cross, the ancient form of gallows, is the very reverse of the promised glory of the Messiah. Jesus Himself had reconciled the ideas. The path of death is the truly royal road, not only because it leads to a spiritual superiority to suffering, which is the greatest triumph of individual religion, but also because it marks the end of the Jewish national hope: the temple is destroyed, and the kingdom is to be given to others—in fact, to all. Here we have the victory of Universalism in religion. Just as Jesus on some

important occasions in His life spoke of Himself as having been pre-existent—an idea which was not unknown to Plato—and just as the term “Son of man,” in agreement with Dan. vii. and particularly the Enoch-literature, must have implied the same idea, so also He looked beyond death: though He may have to die He will still live; His present work is only a humble beginning. Jesus will come again on the clouds of heaven, as the Messianic king whom the Jewish apocalyptic seers already saw in spirit, to complete His work throughout the world, and He will not long delay His coming. Such thoughts are present also when He utters those solemn, weighty words at the Last Supper. The food which He gives to the disciples is an emblem of Himself; it is to serve as provision for the journey which they will now have to make alone; in such manner ought they to hold communion with Him who is parting from them and with one another until the great day of the second coming.

Thus Christianity took its place in history as a religion of revelation, of the rule of God and of redemption; in each of these respects Jesus was the central figure, and the religion hinged upon the moral nature of mankind. It appeared also as the religion of the individual soul and of the whole world, as the religion of fulfilment, satisfying the longings of the best minds and giving them peace with God, and at the same time always as the religion of hope, supplying them with the highest aims, making it their duty to pursue them, putting their finest powers to the strain. It originated a grand and consistent conception of God, man, and the world; it brought

God into close relations with His world, and, following man's course from creation, through redemption, to completion, gave a new meaning to his life; it brought moments of supreme spiritual happiness in the consciousness of possessing a treasure great above all others, that could not be lost. It did much more: it established definite *moral relations* between God and man, regarding God as the Father and man as His child—and no loftier relationship could be imagined. Truly a message of glad tidings was this gospel of the sovereign mercy of God, shown already to the world in Christ and promised anew!

If we speak of these things in the language of enthusiasm we may perhaps fail to find the right expressions, but as to the spirit of these early days we shall not be at fault. The whole *period of primitive Christianity* may be described as the period of *enthusiasm*; it did not end until the feeling of rapture grew faint. It is the period in which the direct influence of the Master is still felt, when the impression which He made is still passed on from one person to another, when people are still living who have seen Him or His apostles, when for the most part people still believe that they possess a reflection of His image handed down from one person to another, from generation to generation, as Papias of Hierapolis did (130 A.D.); as was done, in fact, throughout the first century and in the first half of the second, though to a lesser and lesser extent.

This fundamental feeling supplies the strongest evidence of the power of His person to stir the emotions, and explains most of the individual facts. As to the story of the *resurrection* of Christ, is it a result

of such enthusiasm, or is it a cause of it? As far as we can gather from psychology and history, the disciples were stunned and stupefied by the death of their Master; they were thus very far from being exalted and ready to make sacrifices. When we remember how difficult it was for these disciples to emancipate themselves from their Jewish national hopes, both before and after this event, we cannot but feel that this shameful death on the cross, to which the hateful Romans condemned the Master, must have quenched all their enthusiasm. We might well believe that in these first days of confusion, when their hope and trust were put to so severe a strain, they stood the test badly, even if there were no clear historical memorials to tell us so. At this time, when their hearts were full of anguish, they received an answer to the many questions that were troubling them, and so persuaded were they of the objectivity of the vision that came to them that their faith, which had been for a moment shaken, was now confirmed, and created in them an enthusiasm which was to conquer the world.

It is not the work of the historian to inquire whether or not the resurrection of the body is possible; nor is it his province to awaken a belief in the resurrection in whatever sense the term is used. And the Gospel accounts are of such a nature that we cannot attach any vital importance to the story of the empty grave, though it may form part of the oldest tradition. But there can be no doubt that Peter, and afterwards the other disciples, had certain experiences which clearly proved to them that the Master, *in spite of* His death, had conquered and

was in communion with them, which induced them to leave Galilee and return to the capital, to take up anew by the power of Christ's presence the work that had been so violently interrupted. Otherwise, indeed, it is absolutely impossible to understand the early Christian movement. The first Christians were encouraged, not merely by the fact that they could look back to a time when the Master, who had now been taken away, was living amongst them; they were convinced that He still lived, to be with them to the end of the world. The belief that Jesus rose from the dead, and is enthroned at the right hand of God as co-regent with Him and as King of His Church, colours the whole literature of the New Testament and the whole of life in the early Christian period from that day of Pentecost when it became a general conviction; it renews and completes the gospel, causing it to be preached with tongues of fire and in that language of holy enthusiasm which all nations can understand. To the stories drawn from the wonderful life of the Master, with their great maxims, which were now repeated by the missionary apostles, and to the moral sayings and parables of Jesus, the Logia, Entolai, or Didache, were now added, in the lessons of the preachers, the moving stories of the wonderful end as well as of the wonderful beginning of His life. In other words, the simpler form of the gospel as we have it in Mark, which is based upon the missionary teaching of Peter, grew into the fuller form which was afterwards preserved in Matthew and Luke.

Prophecy always shortens the perspective as regards time. The first generations of Christians,

knowing the Lord to be present in their midst, and full of prophetic rapture, were confident that the last day, the day of the second coming, was at hand. No one of course knew the hour of its coming, not even the Son, as He Himself confessed; there was all the more reason, therefore, to be ready at all times and to keep the loins girded. The cry "The Lord is at hand" is heard in all the apostolic epistles, and Paul expected to hear one day the general call of the trumpet, for "we who live shall be carried with the dead that are raised, to meet the Lord in the air" (1 Thess. iv. 16 f.; 1 Cor. xv. 51).

Such enthusiasm also explains another characteristic of all early Christians, *an indifference to formulas, to the mere letter, and to institutions*. What is the use of setting up fixed rules when the Lord is knocking at the gate?

Christianity as conceived by Paul, by the Fourth Evangelist, who was either John or one of his disciples, by the anonymous author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, contains great and deep thoughts, the germs of a Christian speculation; but these make no claim to supply a consistent body of teaching or a system, and all members of the communion are not expected to digest strong meat, to attain to the great thoughts of thinking minds: children require milk. So we find the elements of theology, not a medley of theology and religion. No other foundation can be laid than that of Christ crucified, but what Apollos, Peter, or Paul, ministers of God, build thereon, this will in the end be judged by the great Master-builder (1 Cor. iii.). Everyone has to answer to his master for his work, and none can call Jesus



Lord save through the Holy Ghost (Rom. xiv. 14; 1 Cor. xii. 3). The early church writings which were put together, on the ground that they were in essential agreement, and made into a canon, betray so many different points of view that in recent years a new branch of study has arisen, that of New Testament Theology, which aims at investigating the authorship of each particular class of ideas. If we take account also of the early Christian literature which remained outside the canon but was for a long time read, like the canonical, in the churches without protest—of the works of Clement, Hermas, or Ignatius, for example—we realize what a number of prismatic rays streamed from the one light. Such readings were tolerated because it was felt that here we know only in part, and see the truth mirrored in a dark saying, but soon shall know things as they are, just as we ourselves are known.

The fundamental feeling which we have mentioned gave rise to the feeling of utter indifference towards institutions. The task which is set before us when we are asked to describe the constitution of the churches, especially the Gentile-Christian, during the first hundred years, proves to be insurmountable. Only scattered hints are to be found in our sources; it was not a matter of pressing importance. Sohm, in his great work on the history of canon law, has rightly laid the greatest emphasis on the fact that in the earliest days the ecclesia was purely spiritual in character. The churches are bound together as a whole simply by the bonds of a common faith, hope, and love; only in a few places like Rome had the constitution in certain respects made some progress

beyond the most elementary stage. The chief and characteristic feature is a spiritual aristocracy of travelling apostles, prophets, and teachers associated with the spiritual democracy of the sovereign church of the saints. It is never the office that exalts the person, but always the person the office, and even when there grew up from the ranks of the elders of the community a standing official class of presidents with many members, whose duty was to convene meetings in a regular way, to arrange for the orderly administration of the Lord's Supper, to do works of love and maintain discipline, the patriarchal stage is not as yet abandoned: there are no fixed and definite lines of demarcation. If these early Christians felt themselves to be strangers and sojourners upon earth, what was the use of institutions of fixed stability?

Yet this feeling of utmost indifference, which saved the church of the "saints" from anxiety about its future life on earth in a material sense, proved to be the means of securing that future. The enthusiasm we have noted supplied the force which was to hold it together and protected it in its young days from a too early exposure to the cold blasts of the world. There was another side to this theoretical indifference—a *practical and moral interest* of an uncommonly powerful nature. To keep unspotted from the world, to keep free from sin in the midst of a perverse generation, to shine as a light amid the darkness—such moral optimism, full of noble courage, based upon the conviction that the objects to be aimed at and the benefits to be gained are eternal, runs not only through canonical literature but through all

the writings of ancient Christendom, for all these writings were suggested by practice, particularly mission work, and formed a literature with a practical purpose. Even at the end of the period the author of the first Christian apology which we possess, Aristides (*circa* 130), is still able to give the emperor a glowing account of the moral life of Christians, without any danger of being refuted: "Christians have the commands of their Lord graven on their hearts; they live holy and righteous lives, thanking God at all times for food and drink and every blessing, as people who hope thus to inherit in a future life the promise of Christ."

These, then, are the general features of primitive Christianity; being of a purely spiritual nature, they as it were lift it out of time and history. And being thus superior to historical conditions, its classical records seem to be eternally valid and binding; for this reason many people in all ages have thought that, in addition to the exhortations of the apostles, even the apostolic arrangements, exactly as they are described, are a model for all ages. This idea has led continually to the growth of new sects. Even the apostolic age, independent of history as it seems to be in comparison with later times, had its own *internal movements and stages of development* as well as its temporal conditions and presuppositions.

C. Ferdinand Baur and the Tübingen school did good service in bringing a historical understanding to bear on the history of early Christianity and showing that the Church developed. Having found that throughout Paul's life there was an antagonism between Jewish and Gentile Christians, he made

this his guiding principle; the Catholic Church, he thought, grew out of their reconciliation. The hypothesis, clearly suggested by Hegel's theory of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, in the crude form which it originally took has not survived. The process of development was far more complicated; the form evolved was more composite.

The preaching of Christ must be taken as the starting-point. Though the message of Jesus contained the germs of a universal religion of humanity, it was often and to a great extent couched in the language of His own nation. He had not come to destroy the law; when questioned on the subject, He declared that He had been sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. But this national dress, which He threw off to some extent whenever, as in the matter of the holiness of the Sabbath, and in the last and all-important question of the meaning of the kingdom of God (Wernle), there was any risk of the husk of His teaching being confused with the kernel, actually proved a protection to Christianity in the first days after the storm which marked the close of Jesus' life. Faithfulness to the law, which meant faithfulness to the nation, must have preserved it from being annihilated by members of its own race. At the same time it resulted inevitably in such exaggerated importance being attached to this, that kernel and husk were again made of quite equal value. The growing conviction that the real treasure is again being lost and a new law being set up, the realization that temple and temple-service are being supplanted by a religion of grace, accompanied by an effort to remove entirely the husk and give the

pure religion of humanity room to expand—these are the things that influenced the development of the Church in primitive Christian times.

It is characterized and represented by a whole series of parties: on the extreme right wing are the Pharisees of Jerusalem, who attached themselves to the circle of the faithful in the city of the temple; then there was James “the just,” Jesus’ brother, whose growing prominence accurately reflects the progress of Judaism in the early church; next Peter, —and by the side of him perhaps John—who follows strictly and literally the line of the Master, externally binding himself by the law, but being spiritually free from it. Thus even on the soil of Palestinian Judaism the new ideas were accepted by different parties in a different spirit. And at this stage it is important to remember what was said about the enlightened Judaism of the diaspora. It is clear that the gospel soon gained acceptance among the Hellenists or Greek Jews at Jerusalem, and here Stephen interpreted the teaching of the Master more spiritually than the Palestinians. This gave rise to the first conflict, the first persecution, and consequently the first expansion. The gospel was brought amongst the Jews of the diaspora, and so was cast into that channel, already spoken of, which in a perfectly natural way was to carry Christianity into the great ocean of the Græco-Roman world. In Antioch, where the first mixed community of Jews and Greeks arose, and the new and third element that united them was the confession that Jesus was the Messiah, the use of the name Christian now became prevalent. This we learn from the Acts of the

Apostles, and the information is in itself quite credible. Here, then, we have the hour of Christianity's second birth.

We do not by any means know who all the men were who first preached the gospel in the cities of the empire; following the trade-routes, the new religion travelled from city to city. We do not even know who was the first to preach it in Rome, the most important city of all. But we are well accustomed to associate this expansion of Christianity with the name of the Hellenist Paul. Why is this? First, no doubt, because we have more information about him than about anyone else, and we know so much about him; secondly, because he was an intellectual giant compared with the rest and "laboured more than all"; and, lastly, because he recognized very clearly a fundamental distinction, and fought the good fight, "a Gentile to the Gentiles." It is doubtful whether we may add, without reservation, that he was victorious, for although James and the other "pillars" of the early church did not refuse him the "right of communion" in the assembly of apostles at Jerusalem, there was another conference at Antioch of which we do not know the result; Paul's account in Galatians ii. breaks off with a jarring note, and we afterwards find that he has left his old haunts for the Greek world of the *Ægean* sea. We may have here a hint of a defeat, but in any case it led him on the road to victory. As the result of ten years' work, the soil in which the highest culture of the ancients had flourished was made ready for the gospel. Then, Jewish Christian as he was, he made one more attempt to unite closely

Jewish and Gentile Christians ; he persuaded the new Greek churches to make a first great and loving gift to the poor in the mother-church at Jerusalem, and was himself the bearer of it. But his labour was in vain. His Christian brethren among the Jews did not stir a hand when he was handed over to the Romans, thus condemning themselves. A second condemnation came a few years later, when the original Christian Church left its own home, shortly before the fall of Jerusalem, to go to the other side of the Jordan, and when after this the city of the temple was burned. It had abandoned and lost the only soil on which it could have been sure of maintaining its position. Jewish Christianity became a vanishing quantity.

At the beginning of the 'sixties Paul, the apostle of the Greeks, was taken back to Rome, to the centre of Græco-Roman life. " I stand before Cæsar's judgment seat," he says. The monarchy, with its power to protect its citizens, came between the zealous representatives of the old religion of revelation and the foremost exponent of the new doctrine which had developed from the old, dragged him to the place where the new religion had need of its best men, and, without realizing it, brought its own rival to the very threshold of the imperial palace (Phil. iv. 22). Paul's journey from Jerusalem to Rome is like a parable to the effect that the further development is taking place on the soil of Gentile Christianity, involving at once consequences of the utmost importance.

In spite of the fact that Paul always remained, to a large extent, a rabbi, it was he who really gave to the gospel its mission in the world. Completely

stripping it of its national covering, lifting it into the sphere of the "Spirit" which seeks out the children of God among all peoples and works in them, he made the gospel, as he taught it, wear the features of a new view of the world in which the cultured people of the age were promised a gnosis which was greater than any philosophy, and yet did not preclude the use of the conclusions of earlier philosophical systems. While, however, Paul made the cross the central feature of Christianity, he taught, at the same time, that it must be understood in a deeply religious and moral sense as the religion of atonement, undisturbed by the fact that the Greeks, not understanding what was meant, regarded it as foolishness.

Thus, in addition to the simple records of the life and death of the Master derived from the disciples, we have a spiritual construction of the Christian material in the preaching of one who, to use his own description, was born out of due time. But before we conclude our account of the apostolic age we must not fail to take note of that mysterious person who at the end of the period left behind him in the fourth gospel an incomparable blend of the two ideas. The gospel "according to *John*" may be considered to combine the two preceding stages of development represented by the synoptists and Paul, since the human and earthly existence of Jesus is apprehended in a most spiritual aspect, and represents the last and decisive scene in the great spiritual conflict between light and darkness. We have here the historical religion, God made manifest in the flesh, the Christ, who is the eternal God Himself, belonging to all men and all ages—and these ideas steeped in



the deep mysticism of a soul at one with Christ and through Him with God, but which, nevertheless, has not abandoned the sound moral view that the truth of religion is shown solely by what a man *does*.

Christianity was now ready to take its course through the world.

### III

## RISE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

PROTESTANTS used to say that the period of the Apostolic Church which started with the first celebration of Pentecost was followed by the period of the Catholic Church, and in this they saw signs of degeneration and decay. The idea is intelligible, since the Reformers needed a complete classic model on which to base their opposition to Rome and to support their practical ideals, in the same way that they could appeal to the unimpeachable teaching of the sacred writings of early times in defence of their creed. But they were wrong. *The Christian Church did not originate until the period we have now reached*, and the Church is Catholic at its birth; in other words, when the Christian communities were first organized, the form which the organization took was that of the Catholic Church.

In consequence of this, traces and germs of the Catholic Church are to be looked for even in the period when the Spirit was freely bestowed and there was, as it were, no Church—even in our canonical literature. But we must not be led astray by developments that took place upon Jewish-Christian soil. On this soil, no doubt, especially in Jerusalem,

some kind of organization very speedily sprang up ; but it should be noted (1) that we have hardly any certain information ; (2) that any organization there may have been must, like Jewish Christianity in general, have borrowed largely from Jewish forms (indeed, we are definitely told that the Jewish Christianity of later times did so) ; (3) that in this quarter at an early date the development was violently arrested, and, the original connection having been severed, Jewish influence entirely ceased to operate on the general movement. Only on Gentile-Christian soil could the Christian spirit freely expand and develop ; and it is upon this soil that the Church, adapting itself to its cosmopolitan surroundings, now emerges as a general, that is to say, a Catholic, Church—in so far at least as it took the whole empire within its range. In this sense we may now speak of the origin of the Church.

This of course implies that to describe the Catholic Church as a form of degeneration or a step backward is both unhistorical and unfair. We feel almost depressed, it is true, when we leave a period of fresh spiritual love and of the religion of the heart and plunge into an age of formulas and statutes ; a feeling of relief and fresh hope arose when these forms and statutes, having outlived themselves, were criticized and compared with the original and fundamental ideas. Nevertheless, it was a move forward. *This was the form in which, by the will of God, Christianity took firm root in the world ; it was no artificial growth, but a natural development adapted to its environment.*

The process seems to be so organic that we are

tempted to apply what Jülicher says about one very important part of it, the formation of the canon, to the rise of the Catholic Church in general: even if there had been no *crisis* in the second century, even if there had been no Gnosticism and Montanism, it would have taken place. Such considerations, however, apart from their somewhat academic character, too readily suggest the notion that this crisis may not have been a natural result of the development. When a third Christian generation arose, among whom there were hardly any persons who were acquainted with disciples of the apostles, and the Lord still delayed His coming, the enthusiasm of the early Christians had vanished, and, humanly speaking, only two conclusions seemed possible: either Christianity was melting away as so many spiritual movements had done already because the forces which had held it together had lost their energy, or it was encasing itself in fixed forms and limits. Irenæus in his youth knew Polycarp, who in turn had sat at the feet of John. Polycarp and John attained a great age, so that Irenæus carries us back, through long-lived generations, into the apostolic age itself. And yet he bears special witness to the fact that the Church developed in conformity with the principle of tradition, which banished all enthusiasm. The internal crisis into which the third generation, roughly speaking, was plunged was certainly the means of producing a development in the Church, determined the course it took and the character it assumed.

Here we have the roots of Catholicism, which in its main lines, still discernible in the solid fabric of

what is known as our sister-church but is more truly our mother-church, was fully developed at the beginning of the third century. Accordingly, a great advance was made when the origin of the Catholic Church was seen to be one of the chief problems with which church history had to deal, and Albrecht Ritschl will always deserve credit for having pointed out a new course of inquiry, different from that followed by C. F. Baur. The work of Adolf Harnack, too, and, within stricter limits, of Th. Zahn, is so important largely because they have made the period of the crisis we have mentioned a matter of special inquiry—in which, it should be added, though starting from opposite points, they have, in more respects than one, attained very similar results. Harnack's *Texts and Studies* (*Texte und Untersuchungen*) were started with the avowed object of getting to the bottom of this problem, and it would be very wrong to suppose that modern students can afford to neglect the questions which are here raised with regard to a remote period of history. What they actually do is to examine anew the question how far the principles of our own faith may be regarded as Catholic.

We realize at once how helpful it would be if we could give a fuller account of that particular period which preceded the crisis; in other words, of *the period of "the Apostolic Fathers."* Certain main lines, however, can be distinguished. And, firstly, let us deal with the negative side.

At the end of the preceding chapter we emphasized the importance of Paul. But if the Tübingen school was wrong in saying that Peter

represented Jewish Christianity, it would be equally incorrect now to say that Paul represented Gentile Christianity. If the picture presented by the Epistles of Paul is invaluable because of the information it supplies concerning certain Greek churches in the early years of their existence, it is even more valuable on account of the light which it throws on the man who wrote these letters, and thereby so impressively described his own spiritual experiences. When, however, we venture to ask what was the character of the Christianity that prevailed in the churches which were not founded by Paul—in Rome or Alexandria, for instance—and whether some other way of preaching Christ in addition to Paul's was not in vogue; when we ask how long after Paul's death the Pauline spirit remained in the ascendant, and even how far the churches which he himself founded showed by the way in which they followed his instructions that they fully entered into his spirit; when we ask all this, the reply can only be that *the great Church of the Gentiles was not built upon "Paulinism"* in the sense in which we understand it from his own writings, with their opposition to the law, their doctrine of sin and grace, their theology of the cross. In such principal centres as Rome and Alexandria forces preponderated before the time of Paul, in his own days, and afterwards, which ran counter to his own particular system. It is not any nearer the truth to say that the Church of the Gentiles represents a degenerate form in so far as it abandoned Paulinism and went over to Catholicism. The Gentile Church never really adopted Paulinism except with certain well-defined limitations. It is

agreed that there was a breach with Judaism, but the positive side of the matter has not been understood.

In his *History of Dogma* Harnack describes the period of the "Apostolic Fathers" as the *pre-Catholic introductory stage*. He then speaks of the Catholicizing of Christianity as, briefly speaking, a Hellenization; consequently he discovers traces of this process even before the crisis. But there is more to be said than this. In so far as the scanty remains of early Christian literature permit of our making any statements as to the beliefs current in the principal churches, these can only be to the effect that Gentiles who became Christians were liable to Hellenize the gospel from the very first, just as Jewish Christians were liable to Judaize it; in other words, they were likely to accept or pay special attention to those points alone which supplied answers to their own questions and longings—and what these were we saw when we examined the preconditions under which Christianity arose. On Jewish soil the chief question was the attitude to be adopted towards the national law and the national belief in a Messiah, and the gospel was interpreted in such a way as not to wound Jewish susceptibilities; similarly on Gentile soil the chief factors were a longing to find a purer revelation of God, a monotheism in place of a continually increasing crowd of gods, and an effort to discover a purer morality for the individual based upon a command of this highest God, and accompanied by an assurance of reward or punishment in a life to come. Both, the monotheism and the moral com-

mand, had shown a want of certainty; both were offered them by the Hellenistic Jews with an assurance based upon a revelation; both were bound to appeal to those who had already gathered in faith and longing about the synagogues of the diaspora, with a sublime and convincing certainty, in the form of a preaching of Christ which had been conveyed to them in precisely the same way by Jews and synagogues: Christ had revealed and certified the one hidden God; the great moral teacher of mankind, He had proclaimed a new and perfect law superior to that of Moses, and in close connection with this He is presented to us as the divine Judge of the future who will reward the good and punish the evil.

Many Pauline and Johannine elements may be pointed out in the literature that arose upon Gentile-Christian soil down to about the year 140 A.D.—in the works of Clement, Barnabas, and Ignatius; and the growth or redaction of a deutero-Pauline literature (pastoral epistles) may be supposed to have lasted into the second century; but the impression we get, when we sum things up, is that the pith of the matter is contained in two ideas: a revelation of the unknown and a command to keep a new law, both more prominent than the idea of redemption from sin through faith in God's free grace. If we go to the root of the matter, we find ultimately that pagan *intellectualism and moralism* are present in teaching which, at the same time, had derived its vigour from Mosaism. No wonder that it presents a striking resemblance to the earlier Hellenism of the Jews of Alexandria, or that in certain writings criticism is



unable to decide whether the moralism they exhibit is suggested by the Jewish law or by the moral philosophy of the pagans (cp. James and Hermas). Perhaps the truth is that they are based upon both.

But while the devout Greek mind chiefly responded to the idea that the gospel would bring redemption, and welcomed the news (Ignatius), what was mostly suggested to them was not redemption in the ethical sense of the atonement, but in the *physical* sense of emancipation from the law of decay and death. In other words, the *æsthetic* sense found it difficult to reconcile itself to the limitations of a material existence, and the world, as it grew older, had an increasing horror of death. In an imperfect form the pagan mystery-cults already supplied what was wanted—under the guidance of a divine leader, the soul could be transported into a life of immortality; this was now provided in a perfect form in the mystery of redemption in Christ. The Greeks and the Romans were not like the Jew. They had not had the advantage of a long ethical and religious training such as the people of God had passed through with the help of their prophets; consequently they had not felt that burning desire to be quit of sin and bring the will into right relations with the will of God, compared with which any satisfaction derived from knowledge, any sense of emancipation from the “body of this death,” is felt to be of slight importance; they had not reached that state of mind which no longer puts any faith in self-redemption, and which refuses to be blinded by the intoxication of the feelings.

This is not yet a theology; beliefs are still as fluid as forms of worship and constitution. But it does represent the *main lines of conviction*, of that religious feeling which ultimately determines the whole nature of a spiritual community and its way of thinking. It was these that produced ultimately that false intellectual conception of faith which substitutes mental assent for trust or confidence; it was these that produced that fancy of the moralists that man's freewill may win communion with God if only he takes sufficient trouble; it was these that produced that æsthetic form of religion according to which the real proof of communion with God is to be found in a mystical emotional experience; it was these that produced that false notion of a church which combines and embraces all this, and that projects into the world an institution in which the hidden God is completely revealed and can make His presence felt by the senses, but in which, notwithstanding, men are bidden to trust to their own powers if they wish to enter into abiding communion with Him.

Clearly a form of devoutness of such a kind would not tend to clothe itself with the authority of any particular apostle, would not be likely to be Pauline, Petrine, or Johannine. Neutral Christianity is therefore the name that has been given to that form which has combined these particular types with special views of its own, which, so far as it was able, has extracted the common apostolic teaching, in distinction from the types known as Pauline, Petrine, and Johannine: *the general or "catholic" teaching seemed to represent the truth to which people ought to cling.*

We say to cling, for the treasure was already in danger of slipping through Christians' fingers. If we trace the process we have mentioned farther back, and remember that this system of watering down and reinterpreting the gospel was being practised at a time when the witness of the Spirit was still active in the Church, there must have arisen a great risk of complete Hellenization as soon as that enthusiasm, which had held Christians together and kept them apart from the world, waned. A time must have come when the ideas of Christians came into close touch with the intellectual movements of the age, when the two took note of one another, and when Christianity became attracted to and drawn into the general religious process of which we have spoken. An "acute form of Hellenization" must then have arisen, as Harnack rightly observes, and it should not be forgotten that by Hellenism itself is meant a mingling of Greek and Oriental elements. The form of Hellenism in question was *Gnosticism*.

There is no necessity to waste many words on a description of that iridescent bubble. Let it suffice to observe that the Gnostics were a class of people who in the form of societies devoted to the cult of mysteries founded narrower communions within the churches for the purpose of imparting a higher wisdom consisting of various combinations of Græco-Oriental religious philosophy and the Jewish-Christian account of revelation. While history is resolved into ideas, speculation is clothed in the garb of history, so that what seem to be offered us are great and, in part, sublime myths. They all

have in common a dramatic element which reveals the dualistic principle of pagan, and especially Oriental, religious philosophy, according to which an inferior God of creation is always distinguished from the God of redemption, who is closely united with the supreme hidden God. Consequently the general historical setting of Christianity and its organic connection with the book of creation, the Old Testament, and with the people of Israel, are in danger of disappearing. The estimation of bodily existence being such as it was, the only practical way of sharing the redemption must have meant the emancipation of the spirit from matter by means of asceticism, if not—as was certainly far more rarely the case—a licentious disregard of moral obligations.

In contrast with this, there were *three systems which tried to preserve Christianity's connection with its source* and its character as a historical religion.

Firstly, Marcion of Pontus (*circa* 140) was clearly convinced that Gnostic speculation must be made the most of, but only because he found it a means of supporting his Paulinism. He at least had been moved by the true spirit of the great apostle, and this made him all the more sensitive of the fact that the great church, by the development which it was now taking, was removing far from Paulinism and becoming a spiritualized Mosaism, a verified Greek moral philosophy, “an insurance office for the thoughts of Plato.” In his endeavour to arrest this disease which was becoming chronic, he succeeded in promoting an acute malady: foisting

upon his religious reform dualistic and Gnostic speculations, he was, with good reason, regarded by the Church as the special "slanderer of the Creator." In the end his chief merit consisted in rescuing the Pauline literature for the whole Church.

The Phrygian Montanus, who came into prominence not long after the middle of the second century, took another course. He wished to stop the whole process of disenchantment and of accommodation to the world, by reviving the old ideals of a church living a life of enthusiasm apart from the world. In the terrible days of persecution under Marcus Aurelius he poured forth his new prophecies and announced the coming of the end of the world. But it was too late; he could only save the old ideals by shattering them at the roots. His own prophecy outvies that of the apostles: the period of enthusiasm is now completed by the appearance of "the Comforter" who had been promised in the parting words of the Gospel of John. Again, therefore, though in a different form, an unhistorical position has been reached, which was the prototype of all the following fanatical movements in the Church; in all of them the historical sense is wanting.

Christians in the principal churches of the East and West repudiated Marcion and Montanus, the reform of the one as well as the reaction of the other; and though in doing so their own losses were great, Christendom itself was saved. By rejecting Marcionism they declared that they did not desire to be Pauline; by rejecting Montanism they showed that they wished to break with the old ideal of a community of believers and saints. The *third course*,

however, that taken by Christendom as a whole, by "Catholic" Christians, led to important results, since it preserved the connection of Christianity with its origin, and, with it, the means of correcting itself at a later date.

It must not be forgotten that when they came to make *their definitions and lines of demarcation* more rigid, they were helped by such notable persons as Hegesippus (160), Dionysius of Corinth (170), and particularly Irenæus of Lyons (180), but, to speak metaphorically, these men were simply the mouth and eyes of the general Christian perception. They gave it clear expression, but it was not they who created it. The truth is, that forms and norms shaped themselves out of what in one quarter or another, in particular and general cases, had proved its power of survival as a weapon in controversy and as an aid to devotion. To speak more precisely: those points of doctrine which had proved themselves to be a common Christian possession by their liturgical use in the baptismal ceremony in many, or at any rate in the leading, churches, were thought to be simply the general apostolic tradition, the "apostolicon"; the readings which had long been used for devotional purposes in many, or at any rate in the leading, churches, bound together so as to produce a full chorus of apostolic authorities, of Catholic gospels and epistles, seemed of themselves to secure a real connection with the first origins of the Church. Finally, if any doubt remained, there was an outward manifestation of this connection in the bishops, who were traced back in a direct line to the churches founded by the apostles and so to the very beginning;

in times of strife without and of controversy within, the monarchical rule of the bishops had proved to be the best means of preserving the teaching of the apostles from one generation to another.

The Church rested in its early days mainly upon these three pillars, the rule of faith, the canon, and the bishops—the general mother-church, as we have already indicated, of all who call themselves Christians, not merely of the Catholics. Who shall say that in this the Spirit of God was not at work? Who shall say that, notwithstanding, human error did not slip in? In view of the importance of the subject, we propose to devote a few words to each of these pillars.

It will be well to deal first with the rise of the monarchical *episcopate*. This must not be looked upon merely as a means of securing the rule of faith, though this is a prejudiced view taken by historians of dogma. Its origin was due, rather, to the general situation of the Church at this critical period; it was the natural and inevitable result of development.

We have said that in the beginning people were not interested in the question of constitution, and have suggested that it would be difficult to form an exact conception of any. But it is clear that from the end of the first century and at the beginning of the second, forms were becoming more rigid even in the Church of the Gentiles. The presiding officers, whose office is permanent, acquire a new importance, in comparison with those who travelled about as missionaries, the apostles and the prophets; and from the ranks of those who minister to the sovereign church there emerges an aristocratic college, against

which a church here and there, in alliance with the old authorities, wages a fruitless struggle on behalf of its democratic form of government. In consequence of the growing misuse of the old independent offices—a sure indication of a failure of spiritual power—it devolved more and more upon those who arranged for divine service and guided a church, the presbyters or *episcopoi*, who were originally identical, assisted by the deacons, to explain *the doctrine* regularly and therefore most effectively. The author of the Epistle to the *Roman Church*, which bears the name of Clement, at the end of the first century regards this organized body of officers as *successors of the apostles*, and in the Pastoral Epistles we have a hint of ordination. It is obvious, however, that in the period of outward and inward struggles which was now beginning, the presidents of the college of presbyters could not be changed without risk, and that much was gained by making the office to some extent permanent. Afterwards, no doubt, there grew by degrees out of the permanent presiding officer in the aristocratic college of presbyters, a single president of the Church, to whom alone the title *episcopos* or bishop was applied, and who was ultimately raised above church and presbyters as a kind of monarch. Irenæus of Lyons and Clement of Alexandria, however, still (180–200) occasionally speak of bishops as presbyters.

The monarchical episcopate is first met with in Asia Minor, where the development seems to have arisen more rapidly than anywhere else; there are intimations of this in the letters of Ignatius, written when he was travelling from Antioch (*circa* 110) to Rome,



where he was to suffer the death of a martyr. Ignatius welcomed it with great enthusiasm. A new form of enthusiasm, in fact, is about to arise—enthusiasm for an office. In earlier days apostles and prophets were expected to produce a direct testimony, full of spiritual power, the word of God; they were expected to show themselves to be representatives of Christ. Ignatius claims that the bishop answers these requirements: whoever opposes him opposes God; he represents the unity of the Church, and is surety for it; where the bishop is, there are the flock, just as where Christ is, there is the universal Church. In this connection we hear for the first time of the “Catholic Church” (*ad Smyrn.* 8). Evidently it was particularly the danger of division into many parties within the Church, of schism, that called forth this enthusiastic praise of what was manifestly a new form of constitution. Symptoms of Gnosticism are already making themselves felt, and it is already obvious what significance, in the process of adjustment and of the development of a general form of constitution, must have attached to this general movement which passed through the whole Church from East to West, from Syria by way of Rome to Gaul.

The fact that the esoteric doctrines taught in the Gnostic conventicles were supported by an appeal to apostolic traditions, which were the more valuable because they were secret, is of special moment. In face of such a claim it became necessary to show that the connection of Christianity with the early days of its origin had remained quite unbroken, as well as to demonstrate once and for all that the

genuine tradition had taken a straight and undeviating course; and it is clear that this necessity must have contributed greatly to the institution of a monarchical bishop, where such did not yet exist, and must have greatly enhanced the authority attaching to this position in places where a bishop already managed the church and—more important still—controlled its doctrine. To meet the requirement, all that was needed was to trace back the lists of succession from the present to the apostolic past; if this could be done, a direct line of genuine tradition would be established, about which there could be no possibility of mistake. The fiction that the *twelve apostles* had everywhere from the very first appointed bishops whose names could be given together with those of their successors, and that this form of constitution was original—this was the first great alteration of history, an alteration of momentous consequence, and the author of it was the incipient Catholic Church. It was now inevitable and for the first time possible that more and more importance should be attached to the doctrinal portion of the bishop's duties, until it was declared that they showed themselves to possess the same unquestionable knowledge of truth which was imparted to the apostles themselves. To the apostles the Lord gave His Holy Spirit (John xxi.); the bishops gather up in themselves the spiritual gift promised to the Church; they are its personal mediums.

If we bear in mind how very desirable it was that the churches, in view of their struggle with the unbelieving world round about them, should combine their forces under a single guiding hand and bring

their administration under the fixed and approved control of a single permanent head; if we remember how uniform this motive was, and how generally prevalent the Gnostic danger within; if, finally, we reflect that when once the idea of an *apostolic succession of bishops* had suggested itself, it must inevitably have spread from one church to another; if we take account of all this, it will seem quite natural that by about the middle of the second century the office of bishop, in this uniform sense, should have come into vogue everywhere, even in Rome, where the development had not as yet been introduced at the time of Ignatius. In this way the fundamental unity of the Church arose; in the person of its bishop, each church represents a definite empirical component.

But although in surveying every part of the Roman empire we are struck by the surprising spectacle of uniformly organized Christian churches, in not a few cases there were noteworthy differences. All the churches may, it is true, have been ideally united in possessing the twelve apostles—not to mention Paul, who by the side of these holds a rather uncertain position—and in their teaching the teaching of the Lord Himself (cp. the double designation to the “Teaching of the Apostles”), but they could not all be supposed to have been directly founded by the apostles themselves. The “apostolic mother-churches,” which will certainly have been the first to develop and improve upon this whole line of thought, must have played a leading rôle. These churches, at whose head in the West stood Rome, where the tradition could be carried back to

Peter and Paul, were the scenes of very important developments, with which we shall deal later.

Once this stage was reached, a further interchange of ideas, a further catholicizing of Christian life, was bound to follow speedily; it was the inward life of the Church which was now affected; we observe the growth of general institutions. From this point onwards the Catholic Church completed its development rapidly and progressively.

No doubt this uniformity of organization paved the way for an advance which we still have to notice. We refer to the process by which the common and well-known belief regarding baptism which prevailed in individual churches—particularly in the leading churches—was set forth as the standard of belief *for the whole Church*, and by which the literature which the leading churches had found by experience to be the best, in addition to the Old Testament, for devotional purposes, was promoted to the rank of a new canon of Holy Scripture to be used by the whole Church.

And the confession of faith used in baptism which we know to have been in use in Rome in the middle of the second century, and which therefore must have originated earlier—how much earlier we do not know—and is substantially identical with our Apostolicon, was as a matter of fact made the *rule of faith* which was binding upon all Christians, and was therefore Catholic. It may have had earlier forms. Theodore Zahn conjectures that there was an older type of it in the Orient; and similarly A. Harnack now thinks that its main source was a document of Christological teaching which came from the Orient and is closely related to the second article of our creed. But we

have no reliable information on this point. It has even been denied that in a triple form it was in the first instance based upon the command as to baptism in Matt. xxviii. 19. It is sufficient that during the controversies which sprang up in Rome between the years 130 and 150, and were due to the teaching of the two Gnostic leaders, Marcion and Valentinus, the baptismal confession here for the first time assumed the character of a password in warfare or of a "symbol," and afterwards, in virtue of the Church's position here as the "ecclesia apostolica," whose list of bishops was headed by the name of Peter, in the Western provinces. People had become accustomed to receive the imperial edicts from the chief city of the world; this prepared them to accept from the same quarter a brief and concise rule of faith which, like a military oath, summed up their duty to the King of Kings. In the West, Christians became familiar with the Roman symbol by the year 200, but they did not scrupulously bind themselves by the mere letter; they made changes wherever the varying circumstances of particular churches seemed to require them. The position of the Oriental churches is doubtful. All that can be said at present is that from the second century these also had a fixed form of primary teaching which was held to be an apostolic tradition agreeing with that of the West. But the kernel was surrounded by a husk which was still much looser than in the West.

The growth of the *canon* was very similar. Here, again, two stages have to be distinguished: an earlier one, in which collections of the writings most popular

for devotional purposes were made in particular provinces and in the leading churches, and a later one, in which a collection of this kind was declared to be the proper model for all good Christians in all churches. The issue has been very much confused, because these two stages have not been kept distinct. One class of critics, wishing to assign to the canon as early a date as possible, have appealed mainly to dates belonging to the first stage; another class, in their desire to place it at a later date, have based their arguments mainly on dates belonging to the second stage; and both have been in some measure right.

When in the second and third generation confidence in oral tradition began to languish, the want of a sacred literature must have made itself felt in proportion. Originally all that was available for devotional purposes, in addition to readings from the Old Testament, was the extempore account of the glad tidings brought by the Lord. Written "memorabilia of the apostles" now became current, and the name gospel was applied to them; in this way the prophets of the Old Covenant, who predicted the coming of the Lord, and the apostles of the New, who proclaimed His arrival, are placed on the same level. New Testament prophecy, which forms an adjunct to that of the Old Testament, shows us, in the shape of the Apocalypse of John, a second germ of the new canon; a third and last is provided by an early collection of the Epistles of Paul, which were greatly appreciated in the churches founded by the apostle, and came to be read in divine worship. It is very probable that the church

of Antioch in the days of Ignatius (about 110), the church of Smyrna in the time of Polycarp (about 120–150), and the churches of Ephesus and Rome in the days of Justin (150), had their own authoritative collections of Scripture, and had possessed them from no very recent date. Otherwise it is difficult, again, to explain how it was that the Church, when its thought was beginning to run in new channels, contrived to preserve this literature, which was a real treasure, and, relatively speaking, its oldest possession.

If one class of critics does not take sufficient account of these matters, the other certainly exaggerates when it supposes that the canon, as we have it, was in the main complete even at the end of the first century, and ready to serve as a model for the churches in general. Had the canon been complete at this early date, it would be impossible to understand why the Apostolic Fathers should have used extra-canonical writings so freely; the whole Montanistic movement, whose very existence depended so largely on new prophecy, would be inexplicable. About the year 160 Tatian the apologist compiled a fifth gospel from our four, the first Gospel Harmony; this gospel, which occasionally includes non-canonical elements, was current everywhere in East Syria in the fourth century and during part of the fifth. The truth is, that here again the struggle against Gnosticism and Montanism, in conjunction with a crisis within the Church, marked a turning-point; and, following closely upon the general institution of monarchical bishops, the collections of Scripture were adjusted, and made an

authoritative rule for the Church in general—in other words, a *canon*.

Clearly it is here that the course taken by Marcion, the Pauline Gnostic, to which we have already referred, was so momentous. The Gnostics did not appeal solely to an esoteric oral tradition; they also expounded the existing apostolic literature in their own way, pruned it suitably, made compilations from it, and added writings of their own to it. Thus Valentinus in all probability had a collection of canonical authority for the use of those—and they were to be found throughout the Church—who accepted his teachings; and Marcion, in particular, to meet the requirements of his own community, members of which were also in evidence throughout the empire, had compiled a canon of his own. Marcion's canon, composed of the Gospel of Luke, which commended itself by its slightly Pauline colouring, the Epistles of Paul, which were all suitably pruned, and his own "Antitheses," was Pauline and one-sided in character. For the future the great Church could not afford to neglect Paul, but in order that this one type of apostolic teaching, which was never properly understood, might be adjusted, it was necessary to round off the collection by taking account of certain writings which presented the common ground in preaching, the general inheritance of the Church—especially in Rome, where Marcion had established his headquarters. In addition to the Gospel of Luke a place had to be found for the other three gospels: the Acts of the Apostles, which represents Peter and Paul as working together harmoniously, now takes a prominent position and at once assumes the



character of an authority ; the group of "Catholic" epistles, which all appropriately bear names of apostles, are added. This larger collection had to be accorded the same—nay, greater—reverence, as being absolutely authoritative ; the letter had to be surrounded with sanctity, instead of the pruning of the text. If Marcion rejected the Old Testament in favour of the New, the fact that Christians who followed the common teaching of the Church chose to make equal use of them, led to both being placed on entirely the same level. The first trace of a New Testament canon binding, like the Old, upon the whole Church, is to be found in the writings of Melito of Sardis (*circa* 170) in Asia Minor. But the first list of New Testament writings which is substantially identical with that of our New Testament, the list known as the Muratorian Canon (*circa* 180), in all probability represents, like the statements of Irenæus, the collection made by the Roman Church. Rome, therefore, would seem to have given to the world not only the apostolic rule of faith from which our children still learn their Christianity, but also the selection of sacred writings which are so dear to evangelical people. But this, it is true, was not the end of the process ; the canon is only on the whole identical with ours. It was a long time before the rather fluctuating group of Catholic epistles was finally fixed.

*In its main lines, however, the Catholic Church was fully developed by the year 200 ; it was also a visible empirical fact, like the individual church, having a military form of constitution, a brief standard of belief which served as a pass-word, and a complete*

code by which to regulate its life. Those who did not adhere to this great Church, by recognizing her benefits and sharing in them, were shut out from her communion, were heretics; those who would not have her as a Mother could not have God as a Father. The practice of identifying the schismatic with the heretic came into vogue at a very early date.

In the fifty years that follow down to the time of Cyprian of Carthage these main lines become more and more rigid: from the brotherhood of churches springs the *hierarchy*. Once more the idea of *apostolic succession* became the principal lever. The development proceeds in three directions.

1. The gulf which separates the official class from other members of the church widens still more, producing a distinction between *clergy and laymen*. When, moreover, the officers of the church came to be regarded no longer as mere teachers but as apostolic teachers, their duties as regards discipline and cultus acquired a corresponding importance. The idea of a priesthood, which is closely associated with that of an offering in the Lord's Supper, is taken up by Tertullian (*circa* 200), as we shall see later. Cyprian adopts it completely. As among Jews and pagans, we have a class of chosen persons to whose "lot" (*kleros*) has fallen the ministrations at the altar, and who act as intermediaries in the communion of "the people" (*laos*) with God. If the "laity" can become children of God, they can only do so by the agency of the will and mind of another person. The teacher and priest who represents the eternal truth and is steward of the sanctuary of the Church, naturally assumes also the character of a judge who opens and

shuts the gates of the kingdom of heaven in accordance with the promise given by the Lord to His disciples. With the rise of the practice of penance, this idea is also reached in the writings of Cyprian. Those who have been invested with the office pronounce sentence of weal or woe, in the name of God, in this life and in the life to come, have the right of excommunication and of imposing penance, powers which formerly belonged to the sovereign community over which they have now become rulers. A congregation is no longer holy because by its faith it possesses the Spirit, but the Church is holy as represented by its organs and institutions, because it is the dwelling of the Most High. It has become an *institution for salvation*; according to a well-known explanation of the saying of the Lord about the tares and the wheat, of which Bishop Calixtus of Rome (*circa* 220) was the author, sinners are a necessary part of its endowment, being the objects of its discipline. It has become an institution so objectively and essentially holy, that it does not matter if its priests themselves are personally quite unholy; the office itself is of so holy a character that nothing can stain it. Thus the Church is a great objective instrument of God's grace which has been given to this wicked world, planted in the midst of it, to educate it. They who share in its life, and they alone, can be saved—whether they are or not is of course another matter.

2. On the other hand, Cyprian puts the matter thus: they who live in agreement with the bishop possess the Church, for the Church is summed up in the bishop. The officer, accordingly, who is con-

tinually referred to by Cyprian is the *bishop*. The monarchical character of the bishop's office, as compared with that of other officers, has been further developed. The division of the clergy into "higher orders," including bishops, presbyters and deacons, and "lower orders," comprising lectors, sub-deacons, exorcists, cantors, etc., was also complete by the year 250; but, in contradiction to the real course of history—this being the second great alteration of history and closely associated with the first—the bishop, since he is an apostolic successor, wishes to be regarded as the officer from whom the other orders all derive their dignity, regardless of the fact that one bishop had been exalted by degrees from the College of Presbyters. His right is of an absolutely divine nature—*jus divinum*.

3. It was to carry on this struggle against the other orders, that Cyprian—one of the greatest master-builders whom the Church has produced—co-operated with his episcopal colleagues. The confederation of churches, which was in evidence at the end of the second century, gives rise to a *confederation of bishops*, who feel themselves to be solidly united. "The bishops are the pillars of the Church." The unity which arises is exemplified in provincial unions and synods; with the appearance of metropolitans and chief metropolitans, patriarchs and œcumenical synods, the development of the hierarchy is complete to its highest degree. Is not the whole proud edifice on the point of attaining its culmination in one tapering spire? When we reflect upon the course described in this chapter, the word Rome must surely rise to our lips, whether we wish it

or not! Other ideas than those of Cyprian concerning the unity of the episcopal church may have occurred to other people; these we shall have to consider later in a wider connection.

Thus at a very early date the growth of the Church was very powerful; it became a state within the state, though, according to Augustine, a *civitas Dei* within the *civitas diaboli*. What attitude had the worldly state adopted towards this new growth?

Before we proceed to deal with this question, let us summarize the results of the Church's development. Christianity was now firmly established in the world; it had undertaken the task of educating the peoples, and in the form of its rule of faith and its canon, particularly the latter—to however slight an extent they may be conceived in the spirit of the gospel—had preserved its connection with its source, the historical documents which enshrine the gospel. Christendom resembles the man who when he found treasure in a field hid it and purchased the land. The Catholic Church thus preserved what was to prove the instrument of its own reformation.

## IV

### CHRISTIANITY AND THE ROMAN STATE

By the middle of the third century the one Holy Apostolic Episcopal Church was virtually complete. We can understand the pride with which such men as Cyprian speak of the "ecclesia catholica"; they themselves were the first "Fathers" of the Church, and as such were venerated by succeeding generations in a spirit of deep gratitude.

How did the state regard this organism which was growing up in its midst, this marvellous transformation of an unpretentious and purely spiritual brotherhood into a powerful legal institution, as widespread as the empire itself, and provided with new and increasing powers at a time when the old pillars of society were tottering? Cyprian himself at Carthage was doomed to hear the fierce outcry of an excited mob, "Away with Cyprian to the lions!" and sentence of death pronounced by a Roman judge put a stop to that all-important work of his which left so deep a mark on the inner history of Catholicism. This was the time, the middle of the third century, when it first dawned upon the administrators of the Roman empire that the Catholic Church was a fact

of great import and significance; and at this early stage they felt themselves obliged to choose between gathering up their forces and exterminating Christianity, or capitulating to it. When the Emperors Decius and Valerian, who were Romans of the ancient stamp, decided in favour of extermination, they became the first real persecutors of the Christians. Two generations later, the question was decided in favour of the alternative course. Constantine could only act as he did; he understood the circumstances of the age in which he lived, and acted with due prudence.

This is not the popular idea, according to which in the reign of Nero believers suffered the most terrible persecution, and were hunted down continually by the pagan masters of the world. The pictures given in the Apocalypse of John gave the pattern: Rome is the sinful Babylon, the great whore, the mortal enemy of Christians. But at last the power of the cross is revealed to Constantine in a convincing manner: *in hoc signo vinces!* More than this, it touched his heart: he was inwardly persuaded, and allowed Christianity to enter as a conqueror the empire of which he had become sole monarch. Thus, after a period of distraction caused by war, he brought to the empire an inward peace, the harbinger of prosperity, and deserved the title, which he received, of Constantine "the Great."

This view is incorrect in more respects than one. The great and official struggle waged by the state against Christianity did not begin until the year 250, that is to say, until *after* the century which saw the rise of the Catholic Church, which we have noticed

in the preceding chapter. It cannot be said that the Roman state itself in the person of its representatives, the emperors, had any clear and consistent idea of hindering the growth of the Catholic Church by persecuting its members; indeed, the problem presented by Christians never became a question that required to be dealt with on general lines throughout the whole empire; we do not know of any formal edict issued before the reign of Decius. Imperial decrees did, it is true, treat of or touch upon the attitude to be adopted by the authorities towards the Christians, but such decrees were either general religious edicts, such as that of Marcus Aurelius, affecting persons who introduced religious innovations calculated to excite the people, or instructions to particular governors, which were for the most part answers to inquiries concerning their jurisdiction made by the governors themselves. They never took the form of direct commands to abolish and exterminate Christian conventicles.

The fact that there was no general system of dealing with the Christian problem makes it difficult for us to form a clear idea of the surrounding circumstances. Unfortunately the collection which the great jurist Ulpian about the year 215 made of all the rescripts relating to cases in which proceedings were taken against Christians has been lost; and in the elaborate codifications of Roman law undertaken at a later date, in the fifth and sixth centuries, by the Christian emperors Theodosius II. and Justinian, this particular material was not preserved, for the very good reason that it was considered obsolete. But even much that would explain facts in the



general environment, such as the official authority of a governor or the relations between police administration and the criminal code, has only very recently become an object of thorough investigation.

Only one course is possible: to collect the separate facts as each case occurs and throughout each reign, and determine the state of the law; it is useless to bring to the study of the records a preconceived and doubtful hypothesis. The best authorities we possess are the oldest Acts of Martyrs, simple narratives that bear the stamp of truth, decked out in edifying language in their religious bearing, but faithfully preserving the legal forms. The letters of the church at Smyrna concerning the death of the aged Polycarp (155 or 166), and of the church at Lyons concerning its distress (*circa* 177), or the account of martyrdoms in Numidian Scili (180), are not merely stirring records; they are very valuable historical sources. In addition to these we have the statements of Christian Fathers, especially those preserved in their Apologies, of which the most important is that of the jurist Tertullian. Decrees of certain emperors have been preserved—of Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius—in an appendix to the Apologies of Justin Martyr, and in the Church History of Eusebius. But the idea that these decrees, which are quite friendly to the Christians, are genuine, has in some cases been abandoned; in the other cases the genuineness is open to grave doubt, though in late years some attempt has usually been made to save their historical character. It cannot be denied that as early as the second century craft supplemented

courage in promoting the Christian cause. Even Justin appeals to what were supposed to be official reports of Pilate on the trial of Christ; whether or not their existence was only imaginary is disputed. Tertullian not only professed to know of a letter written by Pilate to Tiberius in favour of Christ; he is also able to tell us that the emperor's attitude was friendly. The apologist Bishop Melito of Sardis about the year 170 wrote to the effect that all the Roman emperors, with the notorious exception of those vile offenders Nero and Domitian, were well disposed towards the Christians; the person addressed was Marcus Aurelius, said by Melito to have been equally friendly to the Christians, in pursuance of the traditional policy of his predecessors. There can be no doubt that about the year 200 there was a widespread legend that Marcus Aurelius had permitted the confession of Christianity, because when his army was in danger it had been saved by the prayers of his Christian soldiers.

Thus the account of the outward development of the Church and the history of the Roman emperors were emended and adapted from the standpoint of the apologist.

But the fact that people were able to do this without making themselves ridiculous shows that the attitude of the highest authorities was not as a rule altogether aggressive. *How is this comparative toleration of Christianity to be explained?*

In the opinion of the present writer, the period extending to the reign of Decius must be divided into three sections, and the question answered rather differently in each case: (1) the first century, in-

cluding the persecutions of Nero and Domitian; (2) the period of the good emperors, as they have been called, from Nerva and Trajan to Marcus Aurelius; and (3) the period from Commodus to Philip the Arabian, the predecessor of Decius.

At the very outset *two general principles* must be borne in mind; the one applies to the Christians, the other to the Roman state. The saying of the Lord, "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's," and that of Paul, "Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers," were likely to prepare Christians to adopt a friendly and loyal attitude towards the external government; the words "Love the brethren, fear God," and "Honour the king," are placed together in 1 Pet. ii. 17; and in 1 Tim. ii. 2, people are exhorted to offer supplication, prayer, intercession, and thanksgiving in the first place for kings and all those who are in authority, that they may lead "a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and honesty." We learn from 1 Clement that at the end of the first century the Roman Church prayed for the rulers of this world in terms very similar to those used in the prayers of our own Church. Such principles preclude the idea that the Christians excited any feeling against the state; they even show that they developed a life of brotherhood which not only had moral and social virtues of its own, but became a positive help to the state, and must have been welcomed by it on all hands in those days of distraction and social transition.

To turn now to the attitude of the state. The Roman empire, like the ancient world in general, was

tolerant in matters of religion. Having brought all the religions of its subjects under one roof, it was not possible to prevent any individual from practising his native creed anywhere, even in the capital itself; and at a very early date any inclination to do so disappeared. In view of the political character of ancient religions, any attempt to do away with them would be equivalent to an effort to obliterate the nationality of the subject races; and Romans were far from wishing to attempt this. All that was asked in consideration of this tolerant spirit was that those who were not citizens should recognize the deities of the Roman state. Any hesitation to honour the gods who were described as *dii nostri* would have indicated a frame of mind that was politically dangerous, would have meant *lèse majesté*, or high treason. The state, on the contrary, had abandoned the attempt to prevent its own citizens from visiting foreign altars, from worshipping Isis or Cybele, or from teaching philosophical scepticism, provided that they did not give up on principle, or attack, the worship of the state in the person of its gods, and especially in the person of the emperor himself. As to this, all of them were accustomed already to take a political view of religion, and of polytheism, which formed part of it.

The Jews with their strict monotheism and its claim that Yahwe was the one and only Lord, presented a new problem. Since, however, the claim took a national form, the absolute and spiritual principle being concealed, Judaism was tolerated like other religions; peculiar as the Jewish faith seemed to be, it was held to be merely a national cult. To

excuse them from taking part in the cult of the state was of course illogical, but it was necessary. By way of compensation, people were forbidden to adopt the Jewish faith on pain of death.

Since in *the first century* Christians could not be distinguished with any certainty from Jews, Roman toleration of Christianity is easily explained; they were thought to be a Jewish sect, and were allowed to live "under the shelter of a tolerated religion." The persecution that took place in the reign of Domitian may be explained in the same way; it was directed against the Jews, who tried to avoid payment of a Roman tax, but was extended to Christians as well, because they seemed to be identical with the Jews in their mode of life. In the persecution in the reign of Nero this state of things is reversed. This was not a case of Jew-baiting; it was undoubtedly an attempt to punish the Christians on account of their beliefs, on account of the *odium generis humani*; as our authority Tacitus says, "on account of their hostility to the world," which, translated into different language, means on account of their rugged supernatural enthusiasm, which lived on the thought of the approaching end of the world, and defied that brilliant and beautiful world of the emperors. Though Christianity was discovered in the course of inquiries, the conflict arose out of a charge of incendiarism; Christians were not persecuted as such, nor was their refusal to take part in the cult of the emperor at this stage taken into consideration. Possibly the assertion that they possessed "magic" books provided the legal ground for condemning them as a faction that had become

dangerous to the common weal. As yet what made them a real danger to the state had escaped notice; this will explain the fact—or what seems to be the fact—that the persecution died out as soon as the “torches of Nero” were extinguished in the emperor’s garden. The influx of Jewish elements which followed, after the destruction of Jerusalem, increasing, we may be sure, the percentage of Jewish Christians in the Roman Church, caused the Christians in the days of the Flavians to be again lost sight of behind the shelter of Judaism.

It may be that a clear distinction was first made between Jews and Christians at the end of the reign of Domitian, when further facts came to light. Members of his own family were accused of “atheism,” and for the first time, if we may assign the letter in the Apocalypse (ii. 13) to this period, we hear of the cult of the emperor giving rise to a case of martyrdom. Anyhow, when after the destruction of Jerusalem Jewish Christianity lost its power, and Gentile Christians were left to carry forward the development of Christianity, the difference could no longer be hidden. It must have been evident in the period of the “good emperors” that this was a form of monotheism which could in no sense be regarded simply as a national cult: it aimed at being absolute. Accordingly, Christianity could no longer be included amongst ordinary religions and tolerated. *A second period begins, less peaceful than the first.* In the reign of Trajan (98–117) the bishops of Jerusalem and Antioch suffered martyrdom. In the reign of Hadrian (117–138) the first Christian apologist appeared in Greece, and perhaps Telesphorus, who

was afterwards included in the list of bishops, was doomed to suffer death at Rome. In the reign of Antoninus Pius (138–161) Justin wrote down his weighty and outspoken discourses in defence of Christianity; in the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161–180) he was martyred, together with a number of his disciples. Polycarp of Smyrna, who was nearly a hundred years old, was burned alive; though whether this happened in the reign of the last-named emperor or of his predecessor is still disputed. Certain it is that in the days of Marcus Aurelius discourses in defence of Christianity and martyrdoms were equally numerous; and a severe storm swept over the churches of Gaul and Asia Minor, the effects of which were still felt in the early years of the reign of Commodus (180–192), even in Africa. Then the wind veered. Indeed, it is quite clear that Christians were regarded by the authorities and the people, with very good reason, though they themselves would not have admitted it, as dangerous to the state and as guilty of *lèse majesté*; and the *nomen ipsum*, or the mere admission that people belonged to the faith, was enough. Are we not forced to conclude that the state now persecuted Christianity itself?

And yet it cannot be said that the persecution of this “enemy of the Roman people” was of a general and inquisitorial nature. What happened were always *isolated attacks* merely, which were soon over, and affected only a small number of persons. A few dozen members of the church at Lyons were put to death, and in Smyrna the persecution flickered out on the death of Polycarp. Contrast this with the

crowds of Christians and the number of churches which we know existed! And whenever any movement was made against the Christians, it was always started, not by the authorities, but by the people. Complaints and denunciations were put forward in an orderly or, as often happened, in a tumultuous manner; thereupon the governors took the matter up, and for the most part did all they possibly could to render it easy for the Christians to make disavowal and so to save themselves. If their efforts were unavailing, they took sharp and sometimes summary action, as if they had to deal with members of a society of law-breakers who deserved nothing less than death.

That the Roman methods were as contradictory as all our authorities, especially the stories of martyrdom, suggest, is officially confirmed by the famous letter sent (*circa* 113) by Trajan to the governor of Bithynia, the younger Pliny: *conquirendi non sunt*, "the Christians should not be sought out"; as a rule the Government ignored the existence of the Christian churches, but whenever a particular case of disturbance arose among the people it was deemed necessary to punish persons with death simply for belonging to the faith, or for refusing to sacrifice, which was known to amount to the same thing. If this was not consistent juristic logic, it was political prudence, and solved the problem presented to the rulers of Rome by these people who were guilty of *lèse majesté* and yet did good social service and were notoriously harmless, these rebels who paid their taxes so loyally to the authorities. This opportunism was not discarded in the following



reigns, though in that of Marcus Aurelius informers were induced to make their charges by the hope of a reward, and the new and general religious law, which we have mentioned above, made it easier to punish persons who were said to be guilty of disturbing the people.

Since the governors in the provinces or the *præfectus urbi* at Rome possessed extensive powers for administrative and police purposes, called *coercitio*, it was quite possible for them to take arbitrary action. Upon them, for instance, fell the duty of enforcing order in religion as well as in the affairs of the state. Mommsen has done great service in showing that as a rule it was in this way, and not by means of ordinary criminal proceedings, that Christians were interfered with. These governors acted thus on their own responsibility, and were not bound by forms; this alone made such elastic and illogical measures possible as are prescribed in the rescript of Trajan, and we cannot be surprised that the Christians complained when the proceedings took such an arbitrary course as this. The chief care of emperor and governor was to preserve the public peace; whenever there was a tumult, a dangerous riot, or a disturbance among the people, persecutions followed and victims were demanded; but so long as there was peace, little or no notice was taken of the Christians.

This was still more the case in *the third period*, which extended to the reign of Decius. It was a long period of *peace* and of quiet expansion, interrupted only for a short time by the persecution of catechumens at the beginning of the third century

in the reign of Septimius Severus (193–211), which gave rise to the famous martyrdoms of Perpetua and Felicitas in Africa, and to that of Leonides, the father of Origen, in Alexandria. Apart from this, peace reigned for nearly sixty years. In the reign of Commodus “syncretism” is already the order of the day. When Septimius Severus married a second time, the emperor came under Syrian influence, and the migration of Eastern cults to the West, which was such a great factor in the history of religion, culminated. Christianity, whose home was in Palestine, consequently received greater consideration. The syncretism, however, was of such a kind as to give a special impetus to the monotheistic tendency which we have noted above. The sun-god of anterior Asia is represented as the one god of all life. The biography of Apollonius of Tyana, embellished at this time by Philostratus, teaches that the full measure of wisdom is to be found among the Brahmans in the land of the sunrise. When the levelling process began in the separate parts of the empire, when the right of Roman citizenship was extended to all provincials even, and the world-empire enfolded a great multitude of subjects with equal rights, the idea of a universal religion suited to a universal empire began to gain ground. At a later date it was reported that the Emperor Alexander Severus (222–235) wrote sayings of the Lord on the walls of his palace, and in his private chapel added images of the representative men of the Old and New Testament, Abraham and Christ, to those of the old and new paganism, Orpheus and Apollonius; it was soon said also that Philip the Arabian (244–249) was a Christian. During

this period Christianity enjoyed not merely toleration, but friendly treatment. Pagan society, even in the upper classes, is already affected in many ways by Christian influences. In Alexandria there grows up by the side of Neoplatonism a science of Christian theology; its chief author, Origen, towers high above all his contemporaries in learning, and is an object of interest and admiration even to the Roman court.

Would Rome capitulate soon to Christianity? It is evident that the matter would soon be decided one way or another, for *real persecutions* were now starting which were definite in aim and covered a wide field. When the clergy, especially the bishops, suffered, the organization was deprived of its directors, and the faithful lost their leaders. The next thing that happened was that every individual was requested to offer sacrifice; such were the commands, first of Decius (250–251), and afterwards of Valerian (257–259). It was now realized that the ideals of the old age and the new, of old Roman society and the young Catholic Church, were antagonistic.

The terrible state of confusion into which the empire was brought by the soldiers' emperors made it inevitable that there should soon be a cessation of hostilities and a period of peace. Again there followed a time of peace which lasted for forty years, at the end of which perhaps a sixth or a tenth part of the emperor's subjects had become Christians. Christianity had spread in the army, among the court officials, and in the family of the emperor. The Church, which had long since made its peace with the world, and now placed its powers at the disposal

of the state, might now be regarded as the conservative force.

When Diocletian founded new institutions to strengthen the empire, the question of an imperial religion became very important, and he must have wondered whether Christianity ought not to be included amongst them. But paganism once more gathered up its strength in the form of Neoplatonism, which had a religious colouring and accommodated itself to the superstition of the masses, and in the year 303 the aging emperor was enticed, half against his will, to attempt to exterminate the Christians. Christianity has been compared with a ball which when it is thrown to the ground at once bounces back into the air. When in 305 the arrangements for the succession which he had himself made required Diocletian to withdraw to Salona, he had not overthrown Christianity; but the empire, distracted by the wars waged by the Augusti and the Cæsars, was falling to pieces.

The passionate way in which Galerius championed the cause of paganism made it impossible to separate the question of succession from the problem of religion. To attack Galerius, then Maximian and Maxentius, and finally Licinius—in other words, to clear the path for a single ruler—was equivalent to making an alliance with the Christians. Moreover, a man who could read the signs of the times must have felt that this organization which was so thoroughly stable, this institution which was so rich in holy ideals and social benefits, the Catholic hierarchy, was his best friend. Constantine the son of Constantius Chlorus did understand this. Tradition

and a personal leaning towards monotheism may have led him at first to espouse the cause of the sun-god rather than of the God of the Christians, but the political circumstances of the time compelled him to side with the Christians. His wars became crusades against the enemies of Christ the Lord; bishops assembled round his camp-tent, like the priests of Israel around the ark of the covenant.

When he had conquered, and by slow stages and with due caution had promoted Christianity from the position of an officially recognized religion (313) to that of one which was privileged, his contemporaries greeted him as the great Christian emperor who had trodden the serpent under foot, regardless of the fact that his merit consisted for the most part in allowing himself to be borne along by circumstances over which he had no control. Nevertheless, we feel that he was none the less an instrument of God. By forcing the universal state to adopt the church of a universal religion he gave the aging empire a means of support which was the more valuable because it combined spiritual with material benefits: the Church, which had developed its system of hierarchy by borrowing the political ideas of organization, now paid the state back with interest. The *holy* Roman empire of the ancient stamp originated with the *State Church*. Henceforth the alliance of church and state was based upon common interests, interests so closely akin that the attempt of the noble fanatic, Julian the Apostate, to revive paganism was hopeless from the first, and was in no sense popular.

When the Church became rich and powerful, and its clergy a privileged class, the state, through the Church, led the heads and hearts of the masses.

Paganism received its deathblow within the bounds of the empire in the reign of Theodosius the Great (379-395), when Christianity was promoted from the rank of a privileged religion to that of a religion with exclusive rights. At the time of Justinian, in the middle of the sixth century, paganism lost all rights; eventually, at least in the East, its remaining adherents were brought into the state religion, when multitudes were compelled to submit to baptism. The victory of Christianity was complete.

What was the cost of this victory? The Church welcomed Constantine with enthusiasm as its deliverer, and flung itself into his arms; it lost its dignity and sacrificed its freedom. Ecclesiastical "Byzantinism" in its most detestable form was knocking at the doors of the state church.

Nevertheless it must not be forgotten that the age of the imperial church represents the ripe firstfruits of a long development. It was the *first classical period of Catholicism*. Not only the state, but the mind of the people as well, came more and more into the closest sympathy with Christianity—the Græco-Roman form of Christianity, of which we have such splendid examples in the period of the great Cappadocians, and of Chrysostom, Ambrose and Augustine—a form really far more Greek than Roman. Constantine went to a new Rome, Byzantium was converted into Constantinople as the new centre of the empire, the imperial church was transferred more and more to the East, where

alone church life found that peacefulness which was necessary for its expansion. Turning now to this fruitful growth within the Church, we shall have to follow up three lines of development which culminated in Dogma, Monasticism, and the Mass.

## V

### FAITH, THEOLOGY, AND DOGMA

THE Church adopted the general Græco-Roman, but particularly the Greek, spirit. What is meant by this? When we examined the character of paganism at the time of Christ, we discovered two facts: firstly, that great value was attached to knowledge, the habit of speculating and philosophizing, which began among the upper classes but passed even into the lower, the intellectual attitude, and the closely related habit denoted by moralism, which is based on the conviction that if once the most important of all conditions was fulfilled, the knowledge of virtue, of the good, and of God, people might be expected to do good and to attain to communion with God. We found, secondly, especially in the mystery cults, that a form of piety was cherished the aim of which was to guarantee a direct experience and present enjoyment of communion with God. Christianity, having completely adapted itself to the soil of the empire, and wedded itself to the soul of the people, inherits three kinds of bias—intellectual, moral, and æsthetic. The gospel and its ethical character accordingly suffer from three obscurations: (1) Christianity is regarded as a body of doctrine imparted to men



by God, as dogma ; (2) on man's side, Christianity is a form of service, in its more perfect form of special service, a higher kind of morality, even an emancipation from the power of the senses, monasticism ; (3) Christianity, regarded as an actual union between man and God, becomes a cultus mystery, a sacramental mysticism. Such is the orthodox cultus-church of Justinian, which adopted monasticism. Let us examine in detail the process by which it did so.

Firstly, then, as to the means by which Christianity suffered intellectual distortion.

In our introductory remarks regarding the rise of the Catholic Church we have already alluded to that fundamental form of Christian piety that was prevalent on Gentile-Christian soil. We must now resume the subject at the point at which we dropped it. The Apostolic Fathers, as they are called, clearly indicate that those features of Christianity were placed in the foreground which proved to be most acceptable, which supplied answers to the particular questions of those people who desired a religious and moral life and were on a higher spiritual plane than others : these took the form of a revelation of the one unknown God and a recommendation of a new law for the attainment of eternal life. Gnosticism, the great movement of the second century, plunged the incipient Church into a crisis, because the speculative craving was fully satisfied, even if in an extravagant way ; as the name implies, it was claimed that true Christianity is knowledge, a higher wisdom. Christendom in general warded off the danger, falling back upon the great but simple main lines of apostolic tradition, making them a rule of faith ; collecting the

scriptures regarded as genuine and giving them the authoritative position of a canon. This action itself, however, shows clearly that, however hostile Christianity was to Gnosticism, it could not avoid being greatly affected by it. Christianity was a very much more simple form of knowledge than the Gnostics maintained, but all the same it was a form of knowledge. The acceptance of a number of facts and books which were treated as the statutes and code of the faith made a man orthodox, and orthodoxy made him a Catholic, and so a Christian. The gospel itself had originally taught people to regard themselves as children of God, and consequently to live a holy life hid with Christ in God. This involved an acceptance of certain ideas, a knowledge of God and Christ; but since in opposition to Gnosticism these ideas were now demarcated—that is to say, defined and stereotyped, stamped as indispensable—there arose a danger of their being regarded as ideas which might be held independently of or *apart from* the holy life of communion with God; there was a risk that the mere fact of obeying the command to accept them might be treated as something valuable in itself and capable of being detached, as it were, from the ethical principles. However much the Apostolicon, which Luther was the first to explain “evangelically,” betrays the marks of the soil in which it originated, by adding statements of history to matters of faith, by abandoning the concentric relationship of all the clauses to the whole work of salvation brought by Christ, by omitting clear statements regarding sin, the law, and grace, and so

ignoring the ethical character of the religion of atonement, it gave an impetus, spite its simple greatness, to the intellectual development. A specifically Catholic *conception of faith* arises which involves an obscuring of the biblical conception. The latter implies a devoted trust in a Person, knowledge of whom is presupposed, but the religious attitude is now considered to be best exemplified by belief in or *assent* to statements made about this Person. In this sense Irenæus says that faith is *obedience*, and Tertullian exclaims, "I have believed what I was bound to believe." From trust in God and Christ, God in Christ, faith comes to mean the habit of holding definite statements to be true without leading to any practical results in inward feeling and outward behaviour; it is not the attitude of mind according to which the really important thing is always to have one's attention fixed on this Person.

The *bishops*, as an official class of apostolic teachers, formed a link with the past and the future, and guaranteed the purity and correctness of the tradition. In this way the norms which we have spoken of were, as it were, taken care of; the bishops became guardians of the code of faith. When as early as the beginning of the third century people began to take little or no account of the personal merits of the holder of the office, and, in view of the fact that his office made him the organ of divine grace and truth, began to ascribe to him an objective and inviolable official character, it was only natural that the bishop should advance a further step and attach value to the pure doctrine which was committed to his charge, for its own sake, and independently of its bearing upon life,

regarding it as a divine gift of grace imparted objectively to mankind.

In this way the further expansion of the idea of the hierarchy introduced an unusually dubious form of development. When a controversy of a somewhat general nature arose, if a particular bishop was not able or would not venture to decide the matter, the only alternative was for him to take counsel with his episcopal colleagues. The episcopal synod thus becomes a higher court for the decision of questions of doctrine. The consequence was that a religious truth was decided by a majority of votes. Quite regardless of the fact that all sorts of accidental considerations, and a great number of subordinate secular interests, might determine, or at any rate affect, the result, religious truth was entrusted to a method which, however necessary its practice in purely secular affairs, is a pure failure in spiritual matters, where it is always the quality not the quantity of votes that counts. When spiritual questions are treated in this legal way, the belief which ought to rest upon personal conviction becomes nothing more than a *law of faith* which may be imposed, like a secular enactment, upon the minority and all who are represented by it. The meaning of dogma is altered, and a new definition invented.

The old symbol, however, was so short and simple that even in the second century, when it came into more general use throughout the Church, keen controversies had arisen over a number of questions; these could not be settled by a mere appeal to the words of the symbol, and in the third century they pressed for decision in the form we have already

mentioned. An impulse was given to new efforts and further development when the canon was made a second rule of faith and added to the symbol. A simple exegesis of the Holy Scriptures carried people many steps further and covered a good many points that were not found in the symbol. And yet the expositions ought, strictly speaking, to follow the lead of the symbol. How was the matter to be decided? By Christian *theology*, which built its work upon the symbol and as an addition to it.

Gnosticism had introduced vast philosophical systems; its church opponents, when they proceeded to attack it, were obliged to borrow the weapons of their enemies. The Jews contemptuously regarded the Christian religion as an apostasy; pagans deemed it a delusion of the mob; the state treated those who professed it as a sect dangerous to the general welfare. Defenders of Christianity were bound to show to the Jews that it was the religion of fulfilment; to the pagans, that so far from deserving persecution it ought to be greatly appreciated, because it was a reasonable form of worship and had much in common with the idealistic philosophy of pagan philosophers and rulers, especially of such devout philosophical rulers as Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius. Apologists and anti-gnostics were for the most part identical, that is to say, they were the literary people. They were often, especially at first, drawn from the philosophical class and continued to be "sophists"; Justin (*circa* 150), for instance, even after he had become a Christian teacher, wore the dress of his class, the philosopher's mantle. With the help of

the culture of their age, in which they had become versed before their conversion, they championed the Christian and Catholic cause against pagans, Jews, and separatists or heretics. Even those of them who, like Tatian (*circa* 160), spoke of philosophy with contempt, made good use of the apparatus of philosophical ideas, though they attacked the philosophical methods of their opponents. Since they scientifically elaborated the Christian faith, the ideas of which were now for the first time paraphrased and rewritten, they were the first "theologians"—a term first used by Justin; since they protected the interests of the Church universal by fighting against heresy, they were Catholic theologians; but in any case they were "Fathers of the Church" and the founders of "Patristic."

Two points must be emphasized as regards the *substance of their work*. In their efforts to make the truth of Christianity acceptable to pagans, the apologists were impelled to devote special attention to Jewish-Alexandrine apologetics. This branch of literature had already produced a synthesis by combining the monotheism of the Old Testament and the stringent ethics of religion derived from Israel with the kindred ideas of philosophical paganism. Christian apologetics, as started by Justin and continued by the great Alexandrine Church Fathers in a similar spirit, are in a peculiar sense pervaded by the spirit of Philo. The chief idea employed by Philo for the purpose of bringing God—in the transcendental sense of Plato—into relationship with the world without defiling Him, and of reconciling the different elements of truth to be found amongst

Greeks, Jews, etc., at the same time, is that of the *Logos* of God. This idea is taken up by the apologists: the *Logos* is the organ of creation, the organ of all revelation, who has planted germs of truth even in the pagan world. This also was He who subsequently became man in Christ, thus supplying what was wanting in philosophical ideas about God and moral efforts to reach God, the assurance of a clear revelation: this was He who made known the One God, the new spiritualized code of ethics, and the certainty of reward or punishment in a future life—the true, because the only reliable, philosophy. This is the real redemption, a redemption of the thinking man from doubt; this is the sum of Christianity, the highest thing that can be said of it. The historical life of Jesus, His cross and passion, on this aspect of the matter, are of such secondary importance that in the works of some apologists the name of Christ does not appear at all, so much is said about the *Logos*. In this intellectual and metaphysical sphere the whole emphasis is laid on the statements regarding the manner in which God unfolds Himself in the *Logos*, the “second God,” which at first was often conceived in Stoic fashion as emanation, and regarding His *incarnation* in Christ.

This is the first thing that has to be said about the contents of this earliest form of theology, and it applies to the statements made by the apologists in reply to pagans. It is clear that what the Apostolic Fathers as a whole were led to fasten upon as the attitude essential to a Christian and as the true idea of religion, was already beginning to take the form of fixed conceptions in the science of theology. As a

reply to the heresy of Gnosticism, thoughts such as those which are found in a naïve and immature form in the works of Ignatius of Antioch, and which were affected by the great heresy even in its early stages, are ideally expressed. In Gnosticism itself interest is centred on the great questions of the origin of the world, of cosmology; we hear of emanations of eternal forces, of phantom sons and æons from the greatest Deity, and the Platonic doctrine of ideas is particularly prominent; though, in accordance with its Oriental origin, far greater stress is laid on the practical work of bridging over the gulf that separates man and God, the misery of separation from God being here felt far more keenly. It thus becomes more religious, and approximates to the Christianity of those who belonged to the Church. The redemption consists in this: the highest God, who must be carefully distinguished from the god of creation, or the fallen god of matter, sends forth the Saviour Christ from the silent realms of the bright heights of heaven, and makes Him seemingly live amongst men in order to deliver them, as far as possible, from the entanglement of matter. By revealing the highest God He attracts to Himself the spiritual men in whom the divine spark still lives, gathers them around Him, and leads them back to the upper world, leaving the lower world to perish. Apart from the aristocratic intellectualism of this doctrine of redemption, the influence of paganism is clearly seen in the sharp distinction which is drawn between matter and spirit. Exponents of church tradition such as Irenæus, by rejecting this dualism, by maintaining that the Gods of creation and redemption are one and the same, by



claiming, therefore, that the Old Testament and the Christian message are closely connected, as we have already explained in another context, made Christ, who was the personal figure in this story of salvation, live amongst men not seemingly but really, and emphasized the fact that He came in our *flesh* and, by taking upon Him our perishable nature entirely, as it were, created it anew, made it divine, *deified* it. In this way these Greeks were continually and increasingly impressed with the idea that it was absolutely essential for our redemption that the Deity should take upon Him our fleshly nature: in other words, in the form in which the doctrine develops in the Catholic Church it loses its centralization upon the ethical life of humanity, and receives a *physical character*, or, more correctly, since the Redeemer's nature is originally supernatural, a physical-hyperphysical, or metaphysical character.

We have in fact a historical scheme of salvation in which Christ is the central figure, but the earthly history is really only the one Christmas story; the cradle is here more important than the cross, the manhood of the Redeemer is here quite unimportant compared with the incarnation; in fact, it is the story of a superterrestrial being, the preterrestrial existence of Christ being always assumed as the starting-point. Though in this train of thought a different value necessarily attached to the conception of the Logos from that given to it by the apologists, though the conception was brought into much closer relations with the historical manifestation of the Redeemer, it could very well be brought into line if it was regarded as the principle by which God unfolded and

revealed Himself, an idea which people were the more ready to adopt because they could connect it with related conceptions current among the Gnostics, while, on the other hand, they learnt to see in it that principle of creation *and* redemption which held together what Gnosticism wished to tear asunder. The form which the conception took amongst the apologists, which was more cosmological and philosophical, and that which it took among anti-gnostics, which was more soteriological and religious, could be combined.

This made it victorious. Not, however, immediately. We find the Church at the beginning of the third century agitated by *controversies about the Logos doctrine*. Tertullian (*circa* 200), one of its foremost defenders, tells us that the great majority of believers were disquieted by these speculations, because they seemed to endanger monotheism, the single rule or monarchy of God. And this monarchianism was now developed in theological speculation, a number of new explanations being suggested. One party represented that Christ was not an incarnation of God, but was merely filled with divine power (Dynamists); another, on the contrary, made Him absolutely God incarnate to the extent that He became simply another mode of revealing God (Modalists), the Father Himself suffering on the cross (Patripassianists). It was Origen of Alexandria, the great "Gnostic" of the Church, who made the Logos-Christology, and at the same time the doctrine of the "economy," as it has been called, of the inner household in God, victorious at the end of the third century. His training in Greek philosophy enabled

him, in the system of Christian truth which he founded, to hold fast to monotheism and yet to teach that God unfolded Himself in three modes: as the Father, the Logos-Son, and the Spirit. It was obvious that this gave rise to the danger that tritheism and eventually polytheism might creep into the Church again. The danger became acute when Dionysius succeeded Origen as head of the Alexandrine college, and yet even Origen's opponents, even the last and greatest of the Monarchians, Paul of Samosata (*circa* 275), could no longer escape from the idea of the Logos.

The situation was such that it was time to arrive at some general *decisions*. People had advanced, especially in the East, far beyond the brief statements of the Apostles' Creed! On all sides there was urgent need to explain, and so to supplement, the old rule of faith. There were already in the Eastern churches baptismal confessions which incorporated the results of theological speculation.

What was the reason? What had the Church to do with speculative theology? In this connection let what we said, before dealing with the substance, about the *formal* point of view under which this development took place, be borne in mind. In the first stage of the growth of the symbol of the ancient Church it had come to be thought that knowledge of God had an independent value. The confusion between belief and knowledge, religion and theology, makes rapid progress. Irenæus continues to warn people against Greek curiosity, the desire to pierce through the veil of hidden mysteries; nevertheless, without knowing it, he was true to the deep-rooted

impulse of his Greek nature, and, while putting forward speculative statements which he declares to be merely explanations of the belief of the Church, he also includes in the orthodoxy of the Church the acceptance of such statements as have been framed solely with the help of science. It was again the great Alexandrians who decided the matter; though they distinguished more carefully between the beliefs of the Church and the higher knowledge; by regarding them both from the same standpoint and simply as different degrees, faith and knowledge were completely blended. Both are faith, both are knowledge. The lesser knowledge, the common belief, which is accepted on authority, is indeed sufficient, but the higher knowledge, that personal insight identified with a higher stage of piety, leads to direct association with the Logos of God. This is Christian gnosis. Afterwards it was to the interest of all serious persons, even among the uncultured, personally to master these questions. Moreover, since the habit of speculating had invaded the whole of the Greek world and become common even among the lower classes, we can well believe that the men in the streets of Alexandria and Constantinople on the question of homousios beat one another's heads until the blood flowed, and that people introduced the higher wisdom into the baptismal lessons of converts, and required a creed for the purpose, here one portion of doctrine, there another, here more, there less.

To put an end to the chaos that threatened to ensue there were now church organizations which were not in existence in the early stages of the growth of the symbol. The theoretical controversies with

the Monarchians aroused by the Logos doctrine had, in conjunction with practical disputes, led to the complete development of the synodal system. Now, however, this crisis within the Church coincided with a change of fortune without: Constantine ascended the throne. The Church could be of service to him only if it was united and did not waste its strength by internal discord. It was a matter of the greatest political importance to him and his successors to bring the disputes within the Church to an end. *The œcumenical synod* was instituted by Constantine, the sole ruler in the empire, and thenceforth became a powerful organ of political government. Its decisions, however, were arrived at, even in the case of the most difficult and delicate questions, under the influence, often under the high pressure, of the political authorities. Let the majorities have been obtained in whatever way they may, the decisions on matters of faith which they supported became thenceforth in a full and juristic sense *dogma*—that is to say, law, the law of the state. If anyone failed to submit, he was deprived of his position in this world and denied happiness in the world to come. The great imperial edict promulgated by Theodosius the Great in 380, commanding his subjects throughout the empire to regard Nicene orthodoxy as the only valid form of Christianity, and thus definitely putting an end to the Arian controversy, which had lasted for fifty-five years, stands at the head of Justinian's Code as the fundamental law of the state under Byzantine rule. A subject's loyalty completely coincided with his orthodoxy.

If, finally, we consider once more the import of

these doctrinal decisions, which had become the laws of a church polity, there can be no doubt, after all that we have said, as to the direction in which they leaned. They bore upon metaphysical questions which could be dealt with only by those who had had a training in philosophy—questions concerning the relation of Christ's Person to God and to man, therefore, firstly, concerning His relations as the Logos, the organ of revelation, or as a "hypostasis," as it was termed, in God, to the highest God; and, secondly, concerning the relationship of this divine Logos-nature to the human fleshly nature which Christ took upon Him. Both questions transcend the limits of our experience.

The Greek Orient exhausted its power of speculation on these problems; after puzzling over the matter for hundreds of years it did not get beyond the forms in which the more practical West, following the lines of Tertullian, explained its ancient symbol. The human mind is as incapable of explaining how the nature of God, which is imperishable, can enter into union with its logical antithesis, the nature of the flesh, which is perishable, as it is of penetrating into God's inmost being or "nature." To affirm three hypostases—hypostasis not being identical with our term "person"—of the one divine substance or, to express it briefly, an immanent *Trinity*, as was done in 381, when the first great controversy, the Nicene, was brought to an end; to affirm a perfect divine and a perfect human substance in the absolutely single hypostasis or "person" of Christ, as was done in 451, when the second great controversy, which was mainly Christological, was brought

to a close at Chalcedon; to do this is not to offer scientific solutions of matters that cannot be solved, but to put forward statements which are quite contradictory and illogical, because they are deductions made in a logical form from impossible premisses, from definitions of God's and man's being as natures and substances.

We may admit that to treat a question in a logical way, even if the premisses are incorrect, and to do this exhaustively, is intellectually useful; besides this, we must clearly recognize that such metaphysical formulas had behind them *faith-values*, the general acceptance of which was of great importance. Unless we assume that there is some such kind of religion in metaphysics we should find it impossible to understand why such a man as Athanasius should prefer to sacrifice six times his position as chief bishop rather than his formula to the effect that the Son was equal in essence to the Father. The Alexandrians of this later period, at whose head stood the great Athanasius, did great service in stoutly maintaining that it was the Most High eternal God, Himself, who came near to us in Christ, and not an intermediate deity. But before they could do so, the cosmological and philosophical form of the Logos-conception, as expounded by Origen and the apologists, had to make way for the religious and soteriological, as explained by Irenæus, the anti-gnostic, and be replaced by the idea of the Son; this "eternal Son" could then be brought as near as possible to the Father, so near as even to be identified with Him: Athanasius lays the greatest stress on the Unity in the Trinity. Athanasius, and particularly

his Alexandrine successors, did another service in striving, by their theory of the deification of the fleshly nature of Christ, to bring this eternal Son who had been brought so near to the Father as near as possible to humanity as well. They pleaded for a real communion with God based upon a real redemption, though indeed a redemption in which the moral element, sin, and the historical element, the cross of Christ, were almost lost sight of. Their opponents, the Antiochenes, especially the greatest of them, Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia († 428), also rendered a service by holding fast so tenaciously to the historical figure of Jesus, and by preferring to abandon their reason when it was tormented by the dogma concerning natures; in spite of the assertion that the divine and the human "nature" in Christ were completely united, they considered that the excellence of His character was to be found in His moral development as a man. The Alexandrines pleaded the cause of religion against philosophy; the Antiochenes defended the ethical side of religion and the historical gospel. Nevertheless, to these statements could be attached the dogmas concerning the relation established in Christ between man and God, which were formulated already then and later in the West from more correct premisses. The doctrine could now be handed on as a whole.

It was a misfortune that for a time "Christianity" should have come to be identified with this dogma alone. Who could know what religious values Athanasius and Theodore themselves attached to this "Christianity"? How these formulas came to be actually regarded was shown by the changed



attitude of a later age. Neither the formula of Nicæa nor that of Chalcedon was ultimately included in the baptismal confession; a local formula, the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan, by an obscure means reached the place of honour in the Church universal, and has kept it down to the present day—a formula in which the essential points in Nicene metaphysic are deprived of their sharpness.

## VI

### MORALITY, DISCIPLINE, AND MONASTICISM

WE have seen how the one leading characteristic of the Greek nature which we have emphasized, intellectualism, exhausted itself in the old Church. We have recognized it in the work of the Apostolic Fathers who assigned to the revelation of the Unknown the important place which had previously been taken by the redemption from sin and guilt; we have recognized it again and again down to the time of the rigidly dogmatic state church of Justinian, in which the right to exist in this world and in a world to come depended upon assent to a dogmatic formula approved by the state. No fault is to be found with the habit of speculating. Many thoughtful people will always feel obliged to seek to define the mystery of Christ's Person and God's eternal nature, and to establish a systematic Christian conception of the world; if, in doing this, questions are framed and forms employed in accordance with the imperfect conditions of the age and *its* idea of our mental capacity, this can only be described as a defect, not as an error. People did, however, make a disastrous mistake when they confused

values, putting human ideas about God's nature *in place of* God's acts in history, and imagining that when they had found a correct formula the whole matter was explained. By marking out the limits of human thought and making them unalterable, they meant not only to regulate it for all ages and guard it against error, but also to give Christianity a firm foundation throughout the empire. In a word, a disastrous mistake was made when theology and the gospel, doctrine and life, were confused with one another.

Was the life so unimportant? Christianity never forgot the ideas with which it started, the real gospel, to such an extent that it became no more than a philosophy, a theoretical relationship merely; but the subjective element, the ethical and religious life of the Christian, did come to be regarded as something independent, a second form of Christianity—the first being the objective Christianity of dogma. The intellectual form of religion has a twin-brother, *moralism*. If religion is for the most part regarded as a knowledge of God, its spiritual bearing upon the will of man is lost. A doctrine of redemption which is based upon physical facts, which represents man as purely passive and allowing himself to be filled, as it were, with God, may and has run its course by the side of it. But the Christian idea of moral redemption implies the experience that man in his inmost nature, his impulses, his *will*, is so hampered, so fettered even, that he cannot do as he wills—an experience which Rom. vii. puts into words which are true for all time. When the idea of redemption gives place to that of revelation (or when it is under-

stood in an essentially physical sense), this is a clear sign that this all-important experience has not made itself felt with its whole convulsive force. The conviction that man can do as he wills, assuming that he has correct judgment, is prevalent everywhere, as in the old dogma of Socrates, Plato, Epictetus—in brief, the common dogma of pagan philosophical ethic: Know the good, and thou canst do it. Thus arises the assumption that our wills and our moral goodness of nature are free, and that it is possible by intelligent judgment and corresponding effort to win the highest thing that can be desired, communion with a holy God. A justification by works, however—for this is what it amounts to—led to casuistry; in other words, morality has ceased to be a new ethical life, a second birth the mainspring of which is centred in man's will; is no longer, therefore, a set of principles, an attitude and frame of mind guiding the whole man, out of which the individual acts flow as logical consequences. Morality is now resolved into particular "cases," the value of which is determined by the question whether in our judgment they bring us any nearer to the desired end, communion with God, or carry us farther away from it. In this scheme, apart from the act of creation when man was endowed with his noble nature, the act of grace is limited to what God once did for humanity in Christ, especially in the precious gift of Christ's teaching, and to the gift of remission of sins in baptism, after receiving which a man is expected to help himself. The whole of this group of complex ideas we describe briefly as *moralism*. All the Greek Fathers regarded the freedom of the will as an unquestionable fact, Paul's important experience

having no weight with them. The development of the idea can be traced in a direct line from the Apostolic Fathers and the first Apologists, one of whom, Justin, committed these principles to writing (150) in the tenth chapter of his first Apology, down to the days of monasticism which sprang up in the period of the imperial church. It was fully developed when Christianity, having entered into the closest sympathy with the Græco-Roman spirit of the people, struck its roots deep into the soil of the Roman empire.

Yet from the very start moralism acquired a peculiar character. We do not refer to the mere fact that morality no longer occupied the place assigned to it by the gospel, so that instead of being a fruit of faith in God it became a means to work out or deserve a real communion with Him; we allude to the fact that its *content* was changed.

We have found that the early Christians had an enthusiasm which led them to shun the life of this world and fix their thoughts on the speedy second coming of Christ. Paul's sayings about marriage are familiar to everyone. In view of the fact that the end of the world is so near, he advises people in certain circumstances to refrain from marriage, that they might not be hampered by worldly affairs. This advice, to keep their lamps burning and their loins girded, lent itself to a one-sided interpretation; it might very well be understood to mean that it was important for people to sever themselves from the world as much as possible, in order that when the bridegroom should make his appearance they might be found watching. And this one-sided interpretation was encouraged

greatly by the negative character of pagan ethics, which was so inseparably associated with pagan dualism. The same things which produced the physical form of the idea of redemption led to the ideal of Christian life being shifted; the two results, in fact, are very intimately connected. If this lower world is hostile to God, a prison where there lives in us a divine spark which longs for the upper world from which it came and to which it really belongs, the only true ethic must consist in escaping from contact with this world of the senses which is hostile to God, keeps the free-born soul in prison and bondage and deceives mankind, and in fleeing to God. From the wonderful antithesis which runs through the first epistle of John, "in the world, yet not of the world," "in the world, yet above the world," the first part is removed and only the second remains, "above the world." *Renunciation of the world by escaping from the tyranny of the senses* is the only ideal of life and perfection that is left.

In particular, a casuistical importance is attached to certain definite points in which Christian, Old Testament, and pagan ideas harmonize. The life of the flesh in the gross sense must be renounced—in the sexual life and in eating and drinking. Accordingly, people must be unmarried (virginity), and must fast. In addition to this they must practise renunciation in all other things that bind them to the world—in all possessions, for instance. On the other hand, they must give alms and make over their belongings to the poor. On the positive side we have prayer, and that peculiarly intense absorption in God known as "contemplation."

As regards the last point, even the Epistles to the Corinthians show how easily the pagan element might creep in. If perfect communion with God and complete aloofness from the world amount to the same thing, the former at any rate may be attained in so far as the world is completely abandoned and the soul entirely immersed in God. When the eye is closed to external things, no longer seeing anything of the world, when the spiritual vision is directed more and more intently to God who cannot be defined, who cannot be described by any attributes, who transcends our thought and even the conception of being, which in some respects is always limited, then the human being is merged in God; though living, he is outside of the body, is in contemplation of God and in enjoyment of blessedness; his tongue is loosened and utters broken sounds of joy which can only be understood by such as have known what it is to see visions. This is what is meant by ecstasy, "the getting outside of oneself," the highest state of contemplative mysticism (from the Greek *myein*, to close the eyes); for these are the technical terms for a phenomenon which already appeared in the Gentile-Christian churches founded by Paul, and is known to everyone acquainted with the Bible as "speaking with tongues." Paul knows of it, but attaches little importance to it.

Christianity also knows an absorption in prayer, a projecting of oneself upon the source of one's being, a secret and spiritual union "in Christ" with the eternal God. Such ideas, however, represent, not the ideals of renunciation of the world, but the points at which strength is gathered up for that work in

the world to which God has seen fit to call us. It is clear that people who had become Christians when they were grown up, but were originally pagans, might easily transfer their ascetic and mystical views to the Christian ideals. This no doubt happened at a quite initial stage. It is evident that even Paul had to oppose the error that these manifestations revealed a higher form of Christianity. In ascetic morality generally he saw evidence of an inclination to set up a new law, and those who did not feel themselves to have been freed by the grace of God from subjection to any law are weak persons, not strong in spirit.

The matter is already reversed, however, in the handbook of the Church which bears the title of the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, and gives a summary of the views held by a large number of Christians at the end of the first and beginning of the second century; the strong are those who follow the special "admonitions" of Christ concerning celibacy, fasts, alms, prayers: "If, however, you cannot bear the whole yoke of Christ, bear at least what you can." This is to proclaim thus early *the division of morality* into a higher, ascetic form adapted to the spiritual virtuoso, and a lower form sufficient for ordinary Christians. If the latter is adequate, the former is a distinct *merit*.

The division was due to the fact that a higher stage was erected above the average level of Christendom. Our old authorities tell us how high this originally was; we have wonderful accounts of the holy life of Christians in the works of Aristides, Justin, Tertullian; and such pagans as Pliny the



younger, Lucian, and Galen bear testimony which is unsolicited and even reluctant.

From Rome first comes the news in the "Shepherd" of Hermas (c. 140), that the average of morality has declined considerably. Clearly the enthusiastic expectation of the end of the world is flagging; the exhortation "Repent, for the Lord is at hand," has ceased to make the same impression; with the spread of Christianity less reputable elements enter; people who are palpable swindlers appear among the prophets, the higher wisdom is inflated rather than improved. The dangers to morality inherent in an intellectual idea of faith at once disclose themselves. The division widens in consequence. Not only is there a higher stage which demands more than is required of the ordinary Christian; the general level sinks at the same time. All the more credit, then, to those who soar to the higher level!

People begin to accustom themselves to the idea that they ought not to be over-scrupulous about forgiving a fallen brother even a second time. Great or mortal sin originally could be forgiven only once at baptism, after which by the power of freewill a brother was able and obliged to live in accordance with the law made manifest in Christ. Hermas now explains that a second repentance might be allowed to those who had fallen into sins of the flesh. Only let Christians accept the norms of Christian and church practice which are establishing themselves! In former time people were so largely concerned about the very existence of Christianity. This was now, as it were, assured and made objective; the

kingdom of God had taken *shape*. The perpetuity of Christianity was secured by the existence of the bishops, who not only guarded the doctrines, but maintained discipline as well: the power of the keys passes from the hands of the congregation into those of its officers. This Church, or institution of God upon earth, is holy, however unholy its members. To them some allowance may be made.

A strongly individual Christianity of the old-fashioned type made another effort to resist with sheer religious force all these ideas which, from a moral point of view, involved the secularization of the Church. The increasing miseries caused by persecution in the reign of Marcus Aurelius supplied a foil to the preaching of the prophet *Montanus* (*circa* 170) and his inspired men and women disciples. Surely the divine judgment was really approaching, and that immediately! As late as in the reign of Septimius Severus, that is to say, at the beginning of the third century, events took such a turn in Syria that the bishops marched forth at the head of the churches into the desert, leaving everything behind, because the people expected the end of all things and the descent of Jerusalem from on high. All, not merely a few, are required to make the greatest efforts; morality knows no distinctions; only thus can the Church be the pure bride required by Christ. But the old summons to repentance, whose echo is made to ring out clearly again in Montanism, has received a new note through that tendency to asceticism and mysticism which we have already noticed. All alike were expected to follow that higher morality, emancipation from the fetters of

social life, avoidance of marriage in particular, a stricter practice of fasting; in fact, the whole Church must give itself up to Monasticism. Intimately connected with this were the efforts of the Montanists to oppose the whole development in the direction of a Catholic Church (see above, p. 53 f.), to prevent the closing of the canon, and in particular to oppose the bishops with their power of the keys. They felt that the power of the prophets was still active amongst them. By the help of its prophets must the Church itself guard its purity.

Such was the first great fanatical movement in the Church; it failed because it tried to withstand a development which was historical and continuous. By rejecting Montanism, the Church showed, as we have said already, that it was bent upon rooting itself in the world—that is to say, in this connection, the higher form of morality, the real and perfect form, is no longer required of all. The bearing of this decision is seen in the views of two controversialists, Tertullian and Calixtus, who opposed each other. The former thought that in church unmarried women should be veiled, and left the Church, disgusted with the decline in morals; the latter, who was bishop of Rome, and indeed one of the first popes, though originally (if what Hippolytus, his stern opponent, tells us is true) an escaped slave and a bankrupt money-changer accused of forgeries, admitted gross sinners into the Church. Calixtus had good reason for putting forward the doctrine that the office in itself is inviolable.

In the third century the Church enjoyed two more

periods of peace, each lasting forty years, becoming the people's church before it became the state church. Thousands of persons were born into the Christian community, and they were no longer required to take life so seriously, and to be ever ready for death, as they were in the early days. The time was long past when the certainty of eternal salvation was the only benefit sought within the walls of the Church. The firm support of the Church was specially sought and appreciated in time of trouble, in times when the empire was entangled in struggles over the succession within and in bloody wars without, when social distress was aggravated and property insecure, when pestilential diseases became prevalent; for in such times the churches cared for the poor, comforted and released the prisoners, and nursed the sick; the miserable and prosperous felt themselves to be equally sheltered and protected by its private organization. The intellectual élite, too, scholars and idealists, were more and more attracted to its fold, since Origen had built within its walls a domicile for all learning. In the year 220 Julius Africanus laid the foundations of a universal Christian history.

No wonder that the strict morality of earlier days was more and more relaxed. The one thing which was still regarded as a crime so great that no amount of repentance could atone for it, was a relapse from the faith, blasphemy of God, whether it took the form of pagan sacrifice or otherwise; the man who was guilty of this crime excluded himself from the communion of the Church. For a time, however, the period of peace was interrupted in the reigns of

Decius and Valerian by those ten years of terrible persecution (249–258) which divided the third Christian century into two halves. These events were the more terrifying in proportion as people were unprepared for them. People fell away from the faith in such large numbers, that even great churches like those of Carthage were in danger of melting away. It was not possible to hold firmly to the principle that momentary weakness, which was immediately followed by shame and repentance, must always and inevitably involve exclusion from the Church. If people repented and asked to be forgiven, submitting to the censures of the Church, they were readmitted to its privileges. Thus the old rule broke down everywhere as the result of this catastrophe within the Church.

This meant that the last barrier had fallen. The Church had finally, officially, and radically renounced the old apostolic ideal of including only “the pure” and “the holy,” and had become a great *institution for educating* sinful folk. The bishops for the future, in exercising their important duties, conformed to the Church’s norms of punishment as fixed by the *institution of penance*, in which particular ascetic exercises were adopted as meritorious and satisfactory tasks. The hierarchy may have become the Church of the world, but it was still the Holy Church, the stewardess of the heavenly treasures of grace.

The old ideal had not vanished entirely. Another discussion between a Carthaginian and a Roman had given rise to a new schism during and after the persecution in the reign of Decius. While

Cyprian of Carthage gave the finishing touches to the hierarchy and the discipline of penance, Novatian of Rome stood fast by the old standpoint of rigid strictness. His party received the name of "Catharists," or the pure. But how little of the ideal, which was originally so high, remained! How far people fell short even of the Montanists! Yet they would not agree to take the last step and forgive those who had sinned mortally, especially the lapsed or fallen; in other respects they were neither able nor disposed to force back what was a historical process of development. Even so, the separate church that arose, the church of the Novatians, honourable as it was, was doomed, like that of the Montanists, to extinction as an anachronism.

When in the reign of Diocletian, after the second great period of peace had terminated abruptly, the relapse was again great and appalling, for the last time the question was put whether the Catholic Church in any way, if only in the most attenuated form, would adhere to the old ideals. The *Donatist* controversy in Africa had lasted for nearly a century, because the Donatists identified themselves with the provincial interests of the district. It was therefore merely a local movement and could be stifled when sufficient stress was laid on the old formal principle that the truth was to be found in those elements which were general and catholic. What was the matter at issue? If no sin, even great and mortal sin, could exclude the laity for ever from readmittance to the mother-Church when they sought it in penitence—the Church in which alone salvation was to be found—could the question of personal purity

have had so little weight that a renegade priest might be forgiven and again allowed to administer duly the holy sacraments? It might be necessary to submit to a second baptism. Though those who adhered to the stricter view, the friends of Donatus, also called themselves "Catharists," their principles represented only a minimum of the old requirements. It was in reply to them that the final conclusions were drawn; in the course of his controversy with them Augustine developed his ideas of the absolute objective holiness of the Church and her sacraments, his theory of the *Civitas Dei*, the great City of God which has been built up within the world to provide it with the forces of life. To Augustine the great popes of the Middle Age were able to appeal in support of their claims.

The *monks* of the Middle Age, however, could also appeal to him. There was even an order which bore his name, and there were Augustinian Hermits. Augustine did not find that peace of mind for which he yearned until he turned his back on wife, property, and professorship and began to live the life of an ascetic. This shows that although the standard of moral requirements placed before *all* Christians and made the condition of church membership was continually lowered, people were still far from renouncing the ideal of a higher ascetic and mystical form of morality. Indeed, it is clear that the process by which the ideal of subjective holiness developed into a special form of life went hand in hand with that by which the ideal of objective holiness culminated in the holy institution of the Church. This form of life, *monasticism*, came into vogue in the days of Constantine, at the very moment when Christianity, having

adapted itself to the world, was declared to be a valuable instrument of government. The distinction between moral standards was now complete.

The theology which came to prevail in the Church through the influence of Athanasius, so far from impeding this development, served to promote it. To Athanasius himself we are indebted for the model biography of a monk, the life of Saint Anthony, father of all monks. For, in the first place, the physical form of the idea of redemption or salvation, which is the very soul of this theology, makes the real fact of salvation uncertain, by leaving the will untouched, throwing the individual back upon his own resources, and so conserving moralism. Secondly, as we have noted already, this doctrine starts with the all-important assumption that human nature is unholy, that people must escape from it and make themselves divine; it therefore demands a kind of moralism, the aim and object of which is mortification. Thirdly, the only means known to it by which people can feel that now in this life their redemption is an accomplished fact, is the intoxication of mysticism, which indeed is the height of monastic asceticism.

Thus the Church of its own accord, we may say, revived its old ideal of asceticism, making it a special status and calling, a permanent mode of life. The attempt, therefore, to derive monasticism from the cult of Serapis in Upper Egypt, shows a superficial knowledge of the facts; and the idea that this cult included a class of ascetics rests on a misunderstanding. It is true, however, that in that land of ancient civilization people were most susceptible. It was in the land of the Pharaohs and of Cleopatra that men first became



wearry of and disgusted with the world and fled into the wilderness to avoid the sight of their fellow-men and look more surely on the face of God.

The first form in which Oriental monasticism appeared was that of the hermits or anchorites; amongst these the idea of a negative ethic was carried to its extreme logical conclusion. The man who wished to live, like the angels, a perfect moral life proceeded to live like a beast which in fear and filth hides itself in the clefts of the mountains; indeed, by aiming at complete absence of feeling, he became even lower than the beast. When those who sought God in the Egyptian desert appeared in the capital we can see from the history of dogmatic strife, or from the tragedy of Hypatia, what solitary life had made of them. Yet this is only one side of the picture. There were also men full of sublime thoughts, men who wished in an age of bondage to live their own life, in an age of falsehood to be sincere, men whose spiritual nature expanded more freely in the boundless and uniform surroundings of the wilderness. Here a refuge was found for the individual form of piety which refused to follow the norms and patterns of the Church, and the spiritual life revealed a force which was astonishing. And since even here one of the inalienable impulses of a healthy religion did not fail to operate, monasticism could not adhere to its original and extreme forms; life seeks life again, and care for a man's own soul leads in due course to care for the souls of the brethren. The strict life of the anchorite develops into the common life of the cloister, the life of cœnobites. In a great variety of forms, from the

noble ministry of love introduced by Basil the Great (370) into the monastic life of Cæsarea in Cappadocia and the contemplative life of nature lived in his family, down to the mania of the Syrian pillar-saint Simeon († 460), who thought it more conducive to holiness to remove from men in a vertical direction than in a horizontal, yet always with the same leading characteristics, the ascetic life of monasticism became common throughout the East. Towards the end of the fourth century, Jerome († 420) and others introduced it into the West as well. It was a grand movement which captivated the best minds, and may well remind us of the enthusiasm of apostolic times.

Was it not a clear protest against the Church of the world? Did it not mean that people could do without the Church and its priests? It was surely a reproach to her; it surely meant that she had failed to inspire people with a *confident belief in their salvation* in spite of her claim that she alone could save them; it surely implied that people could win it for themselves by the power of that freewill which the Church and the great theologians taught them they possessed! It surely involved a risk that all order and organization might collapse. This is all true enough. Nevertheless the Church suffered the contradiction to exist and did not condemn monasticism, for the simple reason that she herself commended this ascetic form of holiness as the highest virtue in proportion as she became more entangled in the world, and because she felt that monasticism supplemented her work, making it easier for her to play her part in the world. The fact that a few men were ready to make such great sacrifices enabled

the Church to require little of the majority of Christians; in other words, when it was definitely recognized that deeper minds needed a form of piety of their own, and must seek God in their own way, it became easier to co-ordinate the general body of Christians. And what of monasticism? People greatly deceived themselves when they imagined that they could be certain of thus working out their own salvation. After the glory of contemplating God in solitude, there remained nothing but exhaustion and despair. Ultimately, therefore, monasticism was obliged to return and ally itself with the institution which made salvation the work of its existence. This is the great problem which henceforth confronts a fully developed Catholicism: how to bind the two powers closely together, the Church which had become an instrument for ruling the world, and monasticism, which was a means of shunning the life of the world. The new structure was built upon these two pillars. Yet great as were the attempts made to solve the difficulty in the ancient Church, the edifice was not complete in its beautiful and classical form until the Middle Age.

## VII

### WORSHIP; CULTUS-RELIGION; THE MASS

WE have still to notice a third line of development, which can be followed from the first beginnings of the old Catholic Church at the time of the Apostolic Fathers. In the lines we have already traced, those represented by intellectualism and moralism, we have seen that the same fundamental tendencies were at work which we discovered in the pre-Christian stage, particularly amongst the philosophers. In fact, the direct influence of the Stoa can be discerned in the work of the Logos-theologians as well as in Pelagianism. But in both cases we noticed that the rationalistic spirit was continually controlled and supplemented by a strong wave of devout feeling which made Christ the guide to a true communion with God, such communion requiring more than a mere statement of facts about God and an exhortation to live a moral life.

The kind of thing that men hope for in the salvation and happiness of the future is always suggested by what they feel to constitute an absence of salvation and happiness in the present. The joyousness of the pagan Greeks, it will be remembered, in feeling that

they lived in a world of sensuous beauty, and were one with Nature, alternated with the consciousness of the burden of sensuality, impurity and ill-health, misery and weakness. Horror of death made the soul yearn and pray for eternal life with God in a better world beyond the grave. It was this that Jesus promised with absolute certainty—resurrection “of the flesh,” as it was now expressed, having Himself descended into hell and risen again in bodily form. The earliest Christian writers, almost without exception, wrote treatises on the resurrection; they did so, not only to remove one of the chief objections to Christianity, but also to explain to pagans a matter in which they took the liveliest interest, and to demonstrate its truth in a philosophic way without even mentioning the name of Jesus. To pagans the cross was greater foolishness; and although it became the symbol of Christianity, Christian philosophers attached less importance to it than to the incarnation and resurrection, and so made the atonement subordinate to the act by which death was conquered and life preserved, the real defect being a physical, not a moral, weakness. From the time of Ignatius, the Greek of Syria, who lived in the second century, during the age of the Apostolic Fathers, to that of Athanasius and the Neo-Alexandrines in the fourth and fifth centuries, we can trace a line of doctrinal development according to which the most important feature in the work of redemption is the fact that in Christ God grafted the divine nature upon the human, Christ throughout His life down to the time of His exaltation completely deifying the flesh which He had taken upon Him. In

this way the Redeemer made the *human race* capable of holding communion with God in the life eternal.

But how did this benefit the Christian *as an individual*? How could he be sure of the matter and rejoice in the thought that he would share the happiness of the future life? If he obediently reconciled his understanding to all that the teachers of the Church proclaimed from the pulpit about the divine secrets of the finished work of redemption, in his heart he still felt a doubt whether he had any reason for hopefulness, seeing that in the present life there was no evidence of redemption, and he suffered from distress and death as much as ever. The heartfelt desire was not merely for some future benefit, but for some present advantage. Expectation was not sufficient; there must be realization. So long as the blessing is a personal and palpable one, it need only be a foretaste of that divine life in a world that never perishes. To great men like Origen it may have been given after earnest thought and deep inquiry to pierce into first causes and to rise in mystical ecstasy far above this heavy earth. Others, the majority of Christians, when they joined the Church, expected eternal life to be projected into their commonplace circumstances from outside, to engross and stimulate them in proportion as they allowed themselves to be filled and influenced by it. Such stimulus cannot be supplied by the spiritual influence of utterances which only touch the soul and awaken clear ideas and moral forces; a physical redemption demands some material means of grace, some mysterious transaction in which certain forces are transferred to our nature, some transformation which can only be

felt and experienced, never gained by severe mental processes.

The Christian Church had indeed preserved from the earliest times two *sacred rites* which, in addition to the use of "the Word" for purposes of devotion, represented in a peculiarly deep and mysteriously pregnant way the communion of Christians with Christ and with one another; in support of these it appealed to Jesus' words of institution. They were *baptism*, the ceremony of admittance to church membership; and *the Supper*, the ceremony which solemnized an abiding communion. In these two ceremonies, which stamped the whole life of the believer, marking the beginning and continuance of Christian communion, the individual was sure that God wrought a change in him, bringing him into communion with Christ, and allowing him to appropriate the benefit of His work in a personal, visible, and tangible form.

"The Supper" had arisen out of the principal daily meal which Jesus shared with His disciples. At such a meal the Israelite householder never omitted to bless and give thanks for the gifts received from God. The head of the party of disciples made every meal an act of thanksgiving; consequently, the disciples felt every meal to be a solemn ceremony. How much "table-talk" of the Master circulated amongst His adherents! How many weighty sayings, full of love and spiritual meaning; how many references to events that were past or anticipations of what was to come; how many words of anxiety or of warning, must have been uttered during this last hour of companionship! And, apart from this, the meals

of the Jews at this period were already saturated with symbolism. The Johannine tradition represents that the Master spoke and acted symbolically. We have instances of this in the command to minister to others in love and the figure by which it was illustrated, in the Spirit of hope and consolation, in the abiding communion portrayed in the parable of the vine and its branches. The synoptic and Pauline traditions tell us of words of deep and mysterious import, during the utterance of which He handed round the cup full of the juice of the vine, in the manner of the Jewish householder, and broke and distributed bread, connecting those great thoughts about death and second coming, separation and reunion, which filled the minds of all of them in these hours, with the simple elements of daily food. When the group of disciples, which was scattered at Jesus' arrest, reassembled in Jerusalem, for them the Master, who was present with them in spirit, if absent in the body, again presided as head of the household and distributed bread and wine precisely as He had done on the eve of His separation. The common meal now became in a real sense thanksgiving or "Eucharist," and was ever afterwards regarded in this new light.

As the numbers of Christians increased, special meals, taken in common, were set apart and observed in place of the daily meal; the ceremonial of the Last Supper being closely followed, and the solemn words of Jesus about the bread and wine repeated. Thus arose a form of worship, *cultus*, a cultus-meal held on special days, particularly on the day of resurrection, which was distinguished from others as



the "Lord's Day." We find it in Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians, and even in the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (100). Once more the increase in church membership, and abuses such as Paul discloses, and such as would be likely to occur owing to the external similarity of the practice to that of the sacrificial meals so familiar to converted pagans, led to a change. The actual meal taken to satisfy the wants of the appetite was separated, and survived as the Agape or love-feast, while the climax of the act, already fixed in ritual and liturgical forms, namely, the symbolical distribution of the elements, with the pronouncement of the words of initiation spoken by Jesus, became a real cultus act of independent value. There was nothing now to prevent its being added to the proceedings when people assembled together to be comforted by the Word; and when prayers, whether spoken or sung, were inserted, or added before and after the ceremony, a well-connected whole might be formed. The principal service, that of Sunday, as it survives amongst us, was now complete in its main features.

And now to make a comparison. We have discovered, on the one hand, as the chief form of Christian service a sacred ceremony, in which under the figure of eating and drinking physical elements, "sensible to feeling as to sight," the gift bestowed by God in Christ is given to the individual to be personally appropriated; on the other hand, we have found that the devout mind felt it necessary to regard God's gift in Christ chiefly as a means of securing eternal life, and required in the present life personal and palpable evidence of the realization of a share in the divine

nature in the life to come. Is it surprising that the first Greek to give expression to this general idea of salvation in the devout mind, Ignatius of Antioch (*circa* 110), commends the Supper as the "saving means of incorruptibility," and that all his spiritual successors find in it the mystery of *personal* deification which was needed to supplement their mystical doctrine of a *general* deification of mankind through the incarnation of Christ? Both ideas support and continually add something to each other. If there prevailed originally the profoundest *moral* conception of Christ's sacrifice in life and death, that is to say, that of offering Himself freely to redeem man from the bondage of sin, and one's union in love to Him and one's fellow-men, yet the *physical-hyperphysical* form of piety, which was native to pagan soil and developed amongst pagans, necessarily and inevitably displaced the moral and spiritual ideas of the Supper in favour of the physical and realistic, and thus drove it from the region of clear thoughts and instincts into the obscurity of mystical feeling.

And in this dim light forms could no longer be sharply distinguished. In addition to the many Christian ideas which run parallel and mingle with one another, pagan elements were continually introduced. From what we have already said, it would clearly be wrong to attempt to show that Christian cultus borrowed its origin and the leading lines of its development directly from the pagan mysteries. Yet it is none the less certain that the importance now assumed by the Church service, especially by the supper or Eucharist, and the fact that the material and physical interpretation had taken the place of the moral and

spiritual, were due to that sentiment which, existing before as well as by the side of Christianity, gave life to the mysteries, and always dominated people's minds. Secondly, it is certain that when Christian worship had reached this stage, and the resemblance of Christian to pagan forms became obvious, the parallels would take full effect, and Christian ideas become more and more adulterated. The whole trend of feeling was in this direction. People wished to find, and insisted on finding, more in the Christian cult than in the pagan, and this at a time when the masses began to bring their rude influence to bear upon the Church without breaking with their past, and the Church yielded to the temptation to become popular. The worship in spirit and in truth, which is not confined to space or time, of which Jesus speaks in the Gospel of John, the reasonable worship of God and moral building-up of the Church so that it becomes the temple of God, of which Paul speaks, develop into a well co-ordinated body of cultic ceremonies having fixed forms and effective gradations—ceremonies in which people participated actively or passively, at definite times and places. This *cultus-piety* was a form of worship which had by this time acquired a value of its own.

The act of *becoming* a Christian, which means that the soul is spiritually directed towards God, is outwardly represented by a process of initiation into the mystery of Christ; the fact of *being* a Christian, which means that the spiritual man continually directs his gaze to God, is represented as consisting in a regular participation in the mystery of Christ. The course of the acts of cultus is shown particularly

by the participation of the congregation at the holiest season of the year, Easter. The Christian made preparation for baptism in a fast lasting forty days; after the solemn night of the baptismal ceremony he was admitted into the community of the initiated; then came his first participation in the Sacrifice.

The novice who went through this course certainly experienced a number of profound moral incitements such as no pagan cult aroused in equal measure. His conscience was stirred by searching questions; the law of God was set before him, and he was faced by the gravity of the moral issue involved in the confession of Christianity. The famous catechisms of Cyril of Jerusalem started with the question of sin and its forgiveness, and baptism was continuously regarded as the one great purifying act of repentance. But the increasing stress placed on baptism as a form or rite is shown by its introduction into the Creed, the sacred words of which are taught and recited in a formally solemn manner, but still more in the pastoral preparation for baptism, when the candidate has continually to submit to ceremonies, is put through exercises in prayer and examinations or scrutinies, the purpose being to find out, not whether the moral conscience is mature, but to what extent the rule of the devil, who has to be renounced in the hour of baptism, has been broken. Since the liturgical form, the sign, the sacred ceremony of ritual, is made the essential thing, the act of purification is in danger of completely losing its moral character. It runs the risk of being put on a level with pagan *kathartike*, which made mere participation in the ceremony and outward

association with the symbols sufficient atonement for sin: in other words, which treated contamination by demonic powers in a physical way, removing it, as it were, medicinally, like a form of disease. Even the Christian "mystes" at the ceremony of exorcism stood upon the goatskin without garment or shoes, his head bent and his eyes veiled.

Anyone who had received the "seal" of "perfection" was admitted into the ranks of the *fideles* or "faithful": he was allowed to join in repeating the Lord's Prayer, which was another of the sacred privileges reserved for those who belonged to the inner circle; he was permitted to feel the shudders of the *mysterium mysteriorum*, the mystery in which divine worship culminated; he was not merely allowed to see something divine, as in "epopteia," or the seeing of pagan mysteries, but to eat and drink as well. In the preaching also there were secrets of God to be announced, the doctrines of the Incarnation and Trinity, but this merely represented the forecourt to which "Christians" in general were admitted, even the unbaptized. The real secrets are only hinted at—"the initiated know"—and in the meantime the holy place of the altar with the sacred vessels is hidden from the view of the profane multitude. It is true that in the Eucharist also spiritual benefits are announced; the words spoken at its institution in a lapidary style, are repeated again and again. But the overpowering feature throughout is the appeal made to the senses by means of a kind of sacred drama, when as the words of consecration are spoken the gifts of Nature are combined with heavenly powers—when, in fact, the

incarnation of Christ, as it were, is re-enacted in the elements (Gregory of Nyssa). The idea that the mystical body of Christ was sacrificed on the cross, and consequently a reference to Christ's sacrificial death in this sense, are actually preserved by means of a repetition of the words spoken at the institution of the Supper; but in the same connection the frame of mind which we have spoken of gives the words a new meaning: words of loving consolation and deepest sympathy became, at least in the West, words of consecration possessing a magic power. What takes place at the altar, what believers are presented with as an object of worship, what they are handed to eat and drink, represent the birth and death of Christ, His whole work of redemption, heaven on earth. The sacrament being so regarded, a number of purely magical ideas and usages are introduced into the Church, and the illusions of enchantment, which had been held in check, are once more let loose—even in the age of Cyprian. Why not allow children, why not allow even the dead, to partake of this wonder-working element? Mere passivity is the one thing required. This has remained the feeling in the East, the Greek mind being from the first possessed and captivated by the sensuous charm of mystery worship: Let us be absorbed in the eternal world which opens before us here upon earth; let us enjoy the grace of the sacrament!

But adulteration of Christian thought might arise in another quarter; a development running parallel with pagan cultus with which people had been inoculated might have a disastrous effect, especially in the West, where, the minds of men being more

active, moralism was more at home. It is true that moral ideas were again associated with the Supper, but now in the wrong connection, since their spiritual union and relationship were lost. *Sacrifice* offered with a view to winning God's favour, or making atonement to Him for past guilt, formed an inseparable part of pagan worship. When the blood of the slain beast was taken up, the "mystes" of Cybele, the great goddess, received purification and "second birth." And was not the Old Testament, that unimpeachable canon of Scripture, taken over by the Christian Church from the Jews, full of references to all sorts of sacrifices—sacrifices of atonement, meat offerings, and so forth? Did not the Christian Church, too, or some of its members, besides offering their prayers, bring the gifts of Nature, fruits of the garden and of the field, as offerings for the poor and specially as offerings for the eucharistic table? Nor was this presentation (*offertorium* = offering) displeasing to God; it was regarded as a meritorious service, a special form of worship, even by Tertullian. An offended God, an avenging Judge, demanded satisfaction, *hostia placatoria*, a sacrifice of atonement. Thus human service takes the place of a ceremony which was intended to symbolize the most bountiful act of divine grace.

But the real meaning of the Supper is still more distorted when these ideas are brought into association, as they were by Tertullian, with that notion of a magical sacrament which we have described. When the gifts of Nature brought to the altar are afterwards made to serve to remind people of Christ's sacrifice at Golgotha, when by means of the words

of consecration they are even made to become vehicles of Christ's heavenly nature, then by means of their offerings people appropriate as it were the sacrifice of Christ, the fruit of *His* work, Himself. Does not the giver, by this meritorious act, compel God, as it were, to make the offering of special service to him or to those on behalf of whom he presents it, for whom he makes intercession, especially to the dead, who are no longer able to help themselves? Thus ultimately the man who does the "good work" for God thereby appropriates God's gift; one would rather expect a man to do good works because he has received gifts from God.

Such is the *Mass*, though not as yet in its complete form. In proportion as Christendom Hellenized itself within, it received externally, as we have seen, the garb of an episcopal constitution. The two movements are most intimately connected, having a direct bearing upon each other. The development of mysteries in the Christian cultus leads to the cultus ministers becoming mystagogues. When the idea of sacrifice was introduced into the most important ceremony of Christian cultus, another idea, inseparably associated with it, that of *priests*, was bound to follow. Both ideas, again, exalt the bishop above all other members of the Church. But, on the other hand, insistence on the idea that the bishops were apostolic successors also helped to promote their dignity in the cultus, placing them midway between God and the Church. They are the intermediaries of salvation who by their words bring the forces of deification to earth through the sacrament, and for man's benefit reproduce in a



peaceful way the bloody sacrifice of Christ at Golgotha, bringing man's gift to God, and God's to men.

We have not made any sharp line of distinction between the period before and after Constantine. The process of development was a continuous one, the pace of which was not appreciably accelerated until Christianity had conquered the outward world. The desire to christianize the masses, the favour shown by the emperors, to whose interest it was to surround the Church with pomp and show, the powerful influence of the Greek mind upon theology, which could not avoid following in the footsteps of Cyril of Alexandria and preparing a way for the general acceptance of the doctrine of deification, made the cultus more and more material, stately, and magical. Now there is not only a cycle of festivals from Shrove-Tuesday to Whitsuntide in which the last triumphal days of the life of Christ are cultically celebrated, but also a Christmas cycle, with Advent before and Epiphany afterwards, which represents its wonderful beginning. The observance of the birthday festival on the 25th of December originated in Rome. Thus the ecclesiastical year comes into existence. Festivals, however, were not omitted in the other half of the year. In addition to the Christ-cycle, there arises a Mary-cycle, the growth of which was promoted by the important position assumed by the incarnation in Christological dogma. Then in addition to Mary there are the apostles and saints, martyrs and ascetics. By the worship of these the ancient hero-cult was revived, just as the cult of the dead was continued in the

worship of relics. In these things people sought protection against the ceaseless attacks of those demons with which their imagination peopled the air, as well as that unrestrained festive joy to which they had become accustomed in earlier days. In this respect no distinction is to be drawn between East and West. If even Augustine saw no reason to doubt the most portentous miracles, if Ambrose is ready to use, or rather to misuse, the discovery of relics for the highest ends, the ends of his church, why need we feel surprise when a poet like Paulinus of Nola seems to live more by faith in his beloved patron-saint Felix than by faith in the exalted Redeemer?

Eternity must be palpably near. Associated as every feature in the cultus is with the most absolute and spiritual things, yet the senses, one and all, have to be satisfied; the idea of sacrament pervades everything, yet the holy secret must be capable of revelation, the symbol must be full of real power. How many sacraments there were it is no longer possible to say, nor did people know even in those days. Even the cross, sacred salt, and sacred anointing-oil were sacraments.

Happy the man who was deemed worthy to control this wealth of divine forces, who was chosen to be the minister of divine grace! Happy, too, the layman whose life was enriched by this wealth, by his share in the devout exercises of the Church! Like Hannah, he might feel that God was nearest to those who spent their whole time in the temple. Piety has become identical with cultic devotion.

## VIII

### ALTERED STATE OF THE WORLD ; BYZANTIUM AND THE WEST

IF we divide history into the great sections ancient, mediæval, modern, and recent, all importance attaches to the appearance of those new forces which outwardly and inwardly transform the life of mankind. The line of demarcation needs to be drawn at the point at which the new forces, overcoming all opposition, so powerfully alter the general form of life as to make it unintelligible unless they are clearly kept in view. No section seems to be so clearly defined as the period between the ancient world and the Middle Age. The ancient Teutons seem to have left such a clear and deep mark upon the course of history that no doubt can remain as to their having altered the face of things. Not in the mere sense that we have to speak of different views and new spiritual forces, but in the sense that the state of the world was different *before* the irruption of the ancient Teutons and *after* what is known as the great migration of the nations, between which occurred the tragical collapse of a whole world. On the one side stood the ancient world with its splendid and highly developed civilization, its culture famous for a thousand years,

the Roman empire, lying round the basin of the Mediterranean, uniting the subject nations, incorporating such civilizations as the ancient Egyptian and Oriental, the old Greek and the later Roman, the new Gallic, African and Spanish—but the whole over-refined, surfeited, crumbling, in part senile! On the one side, the rude strength of new and younger peoples, the healthy barbarism of Germany's ancestors; across the frontier, the centre of gravity moved this side of the Alps to the Seine and the Rhine, and Rome, the erstwhile centre of the world, pushed back to the circumference! Surely there are deep divisions here such as are not to be found in the period between the Middle Age and the Modern Age! Here the drama of history runs its course always on the same soil. In the year 1000 we are confronted with the history of Germany, England, France, and Italy, just as we are to-day. The course of development from Clovis and Charles the Great is rectilinear; no such terrible break occurs again!

And yet the matter is by no means as simple as it seems. Reserving the name or description Modern Age for a later period whose spirit is more closely allied to our own, we may apply the designation *Middle Age* to the preceding centuries starting with the time in which the new state of the world arose. We imply, of course, that the whole period viewed from some points of view may be attached to the Modern Age, but considered from other points may be connected with the ancient world. Moreover, as regards the history of the world, the history of art and literature, it is instructive to consider how far and

to what extent the whole of the Middle Age is a direct continuation and *offshoot of ancient thought*. Indeed, as far as church history is concerned, it is really necessary to do so. For voluminous as are the riches of history as regards life in the Middle Age, *church* life can be reduced to a few forms and principles which are immediately and inseparably connected with the church practice in ancient Christendom. Constitution and cultus, piety and theology, are different from what they were in the ancient world, but they are only variations or developments of the same basic forms. They are each and all ruled by *one* system; *one* principle, and the maintenance of this one historical principle which has survived the great break, connects the two parts, now separate, to a much greater extent than the different practices which have arisen in points of detail separate them. The principle is that of the Catholic Church, as we have seen it develop, the hierarchy as allied to monasticism.

As the idea of the holy Roman empire was handed on to the Middle Age, the idea of the Catholic Church of the world passed over likewise, and in a more unbroken way, and connected the two periods. Imperium and Sacerdotium, the power of the emperors and the power of the priests—these two keynotes sum up the history of the ancient world since Constantine. Imperium and sacerdotium are also the keynotes of the Middle Age. This might, perhaps, suggest the advisability of assigning the whole period of the undivided rule of the Catholic Church to a single section, and of contrasting with it the period when, a single form of church life having

broken down, people henceforth, after the catastrophes of the Reformation and religious wars, worshipped God in separate communities, or even ceased to worship Him altogether, if they were so disposed, now that humanity had come of age.

A division into a Greek-Catholic and a Western-Roman-Catholic Church would not bear comparison with this. It does not go deep enough, both being shoots of the same branch—the Catholic Church, the hierarchy allied with monasticism. The germs of those differences which led to schism in the seventh century are perceptible at a much earlier date. If the differences are to be properly understood, we must pierce deep into the ancient history of the Church, as we propose to show. They were so far from leading Greek Christians of the East away from Catholicism, in the sense in which we have come to understand it, that it is more difficult in their case than in the case of the West to draw a sharp line of demarcation between the ancient and the Middle Age. For however cramped Christianity may have become, in so far as any remained, it was rooted in the same soil and lived its life always in the same place. There was no breach in the continuity of development down to the time of the conquest by the Turks on the eve of the Reformation, when what was left of it was extirpated. It was then that the whole weight of Greek Christianity first passed to the northern barbaric peoples of Slavonic stock, and that a new epoch commenced. But even if it had been otherwise, even if the East from the time of Justinian had not travelled along the old path to its doom, as far as we are concerned everything turns on the fate

of the Christian peoples of the West, since they were the instruments of future development.

Let us, therefore, familiarize ourselves with the thought that the period extending from the origin of the Catholic Church in the second century, to the collapse of Rome, through the Reformation, to the overthrow of Byzantium by the Turks, is a period that is well marked and connected—*the Christian Middle Age is the continuation of the ancient period of the Christian Church.*

When once we have done this, we may proceed to ask, What, as regards the Church, are the new and distinctive points which at least justify us in making a division? Again the first fact that we discover is that of a *world of new peoples*. It is not particular facts or personalities, or even an entirely new way of regarding the world, that mark the new epoch, but those great migrations of peoples which shook humanity, fused races, and changed the map.

Strictly speaking, therefore, it is impossible to make the history of the ancient Church terminate at the same point in the East and West alike. The East was affected by an irruption as well, but this was not caused by the Germanic migration. Though the change first began here with the inroad of the Visigoths at the end of the fourth century, a generation after the death of Constantine, it was only a passing evil, partly, in fact, a blessing, since the provinces and the armies of the emperor were replenished through the Germanic settlements. The bulk travelled farther, and the "fall" of the Western empire began at the beginning of the fifth century when Rome was sacked by Alaric, the kingdoms of

the Suevi and Visigoths founded in Spain and the South of France, and the old North African province fell a prey to the Vandals; it was completed in the course of the century. As far, therefore, as Western Christendom was concerned the power of the forms in use in the old imperial church remained unbroken only for a very short time.

But the catastrophe in *the East*, another migration, did not take place until the seventh century, two hundred years later, when the Arabs made their inroad. In the Greek Church, therefore, the alliance between church and state could establish itself; people could undertake to solve speculative problems and think them out; the new monastic forms of piety could be made part of the organization of the Church.

Nevertheless, strengthened as church and state had been in this way, they were shattered piece by piece in the seventh century. The empire of the East became practically a *Greek* dominion and nothing else; the only places that remained were inhabited by Greeks—Thrace, the ancient land of Greece, a portion of Asia Minor, with Byzantium in the centre. Neither church nor state had any power of opposition left. Though confined in space, the religion that represented a true life in God might have concentrated its forces more than ever, and have exerted its beneficent influence upon the conquerors. It did, in fact, often happen that the man who gained material victories with the help of the sword was spiritually conquered by the vanquished party. Thus the Romans were spiritually overcome by the conquered Greeks, the Greeks and Romans by the religions of their Eastern subjects, by



the despised Israelites and the spiritual forms of worship which emanated from them. But here was no sign of this. Islam, wherever it had once planted the flag of the Prophet, stood firm like a wall, and the flag was carried to a great distance, even far into the West. The Arab invasion brought the crescent to every part of North Africa—the province of Tertullian, Cyprian and Augustine was irretrievably lost—and in the eighth century carried it over to Spain; nor could it be dislodged from the soil of Western Europe until shortly before the Reformation. The South of France, even, was in great danger, and the Saracens for a long time preserved a hold over Southern Italy, Naples, and Sicily. Not only almost the whole of the East but all the provinces of the imperial church in the South as well were lost, nearly all the districts which Justinian's great armies had won back for East Rome. From Byzantium, from the time-honoured sees of the patriarchs in Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, from the many thousands of followers of Christ who lived on under Arab rule, no force came forth to stem the tide. What did it mean?

Writers have called attention to the fresh, unbroken strength of these sons of the wilderness, the mailed fist, the blood-and-fire theory of propaganda, the power of development inherent in a people whose old-world past, though hidden from us, was not barbaric; but all this is insufficient to explain the phenomenon that down to this very hour Islam has continued to stand firm as a wall on the soil of the Greek Church, and in the district in which Christianity first arose, the Holy Land—an abiding

reproach to Christendom, an eyesore, constituting a problem which presses for a proper explanation. Are we to conclude that the Arab religion is superior, or to credit Islam, or the religion of complete resignation to the will of God, with greater recruiting power than Christianity?

Mohammedanism could certainly boast of some great advantages. It had absorbed part of Judaism and part of Christianity, and claimed to be really the ancient religion of Abraham. It had produced a vigorous form of monotheism, the lines of a simple spiritual worship with which was combined a national Arabian paganism such as the cultus of the Caaba; had taught men to pray to the invisible Allah alone, though it had also made unconditional the worship of the one prophet and religious founder and of the one holy book, these being visible entities; finally, while prepared to make concessions to the passion, sensuality, and imagination of Orientals, it had set up clear moral commands.

We have to explain the fact that the mixed religion which had thus arisen, and may be regarded as the successor of Gnosticism and the last great heresy, though not original nor worthy to be compared with the spiritual greatness of the gospel, served as a check to the movement originated by the gospel, and succeeded in outbidding the Church. But we can only do so provided that a mistaken idea of apologetics is not allowed to embellish the *form which Christianity took* in the days and districts in question.

Christians now paid the penalty for having squandered their whole strength in fruitless speculation. While Islam was knocking at the doors of the Church,

Christians were everlastingly disputing about the two natures in Christ. In addition to dogmatic differences, trouble was caused also by the old particularist interests of provinces and districts in Egypt and Syria. The emperors tried in vain to discover the magic formula of unity. If it were maintained that in Christ two perfect natures were united, it was asked whether in that case there were two methods of working and two wills—and the party which was in a minority, being excommunicated as guilty of execrable heresy, either formed a separate heretical church, like the Persian Nestorian community which arose after the synod of Chalcedon, or was disposed to seek outside help against the wrong-headed theology of the capital of the empire. The Egyptians who sought, by following, as they supposed, in the footsteps of Athanasius and Cyril, to avoid all offence, held firmly to the view that there was one nature in Christ. These Monophysites, when they welcomed the Arabs as deliverers, dug their own grave. The result is seen in the Coptic-Egyptian and the Ethiopic-Abyssinian churches of the present day. The former, which had six million adherents at the time of the Arab conquest, now numbers no more than 100,000; the latter is a mere mummy using a language in its worship which the priests themselves do not understand. A monophysite church of a different character, the Armenian, still stands erect and has some life left in it, though lashed by storms, and sadly persecuted at the present time. The enemy is still Mohammedanism, and the rest of Christendom can only show its love for its isolated sister in a clandestine way.

Christians now paid the penalty in a very terrible way for having dissolved the alliance between religion and morality, for having imagined that people could serve God while abandoning the principles of Christian morality, truthfulness and love, in their relations with those who described the inscrutable being of God in a way somewhat different from their own. The clear voice of conscience was confused, or awakened no exercise of manly strength in people whose faith was in externals. For actual Christianity was shown by flying from the world and avoiding its moral claims and its works of social service; the highest aim was to enjoy communion with the God who deifies human nature. And those who did not join the devotees of a "solitary life," found a substitute in the mysteries of the cultus, provided that they conformed in every particular to its rites and the holy ceremonies of initiation. Confident that the treasures of Christianity could never again be lost, at the very time when they were ascending into the lofty regions of theoretical abstractions and refinements, people were allowing life, as it really was, to be surfeited with the worship of saints and relics, angels and images, and popular superstition, the people being permitted to retain their old illusions as a lower form of Christianity, with the result that their leaders finally sank to the same depths themselves. It is well known that at the present time Mohammedans are still disposed to regard the Greek cultus in the south of Russia as a form of paganism.

Thus the ground literally disappeared from under the feet of Eastern Christendom at the moment when it imagined itself to have come near to God. In a

restricted sphere, being now no more than the Greek *Byzantine* church, the Church reached its final conclusions. Even the power and pleasure of speculation vanished, now that it had become dangerous to transgress the well-defined limits of permissible thought. John of Damascus († 754), in a great compilation which he called the "Source of Knowledge," gathered up the achievements of the ancient Church. Henceforth this is supposed to be the only source from which knowledge need be drawn; henceforth the only science is that of *scholasticism*; in other words, a formal recension of what has been taught as in a school, sacred tradition. The work of masters had come to an end; the art of scholars had begun.

The essential meaning of the great statements of dogma was likewise lost. The symbol, incorporated in the cultus, read on Sundays from the most holy place and in the most solemn service of the Mass, was made a holy secret, one of a number of mysteries. Finally, when the state gained complete rule over the church, the same interest could not attach to the constitution. Piety was concentrated in the cultus, through which everyone realized the presence of God here upon earth, and in that mysticism of the cultus which became a cultus of feeling. The name of an obscure apostolic authority, Dionysius the Areopagite (Acts xvii. 34), was affixed to a number of very influential writings, dating from about the year 500, in which all the speculative power that remained was employed to bring the earthly cultus into the closest possible connection with the system of superterrestrial forces which theological metaphysics taught, and further to teach men to regard the officers of

the Church, the earthly hierarchy, as an organ used by a heavenly hierarchy for transferring heavenly powers to the poor nature of man. The meaning of the term orthodox is again changed. The orthodox person is one who submits to the enactments of the church, particularly one who conforms in all respects to the cultus.

The last great controversy of the Eastern Church was concerned, not with formulas, but with *images*. The divine was rendered palpable and visible, and made flesh, even by means of images. People scraped the colour from these and mingled it in the Cup. The climax and extreme result of the system was reached when stress was laid, not upon the will but upon the "nature," and the doctrine of deification was applied to everything. The æstheticism which, as we have seen, provided from the beginning, in addition to intellectualism and moralism, a third channel of development, receives an importance which makes everything else sink into insignificance. Finally, if the symbol contains and conveys everywhere real divine powers, if, when they take part in the cultus, people are surrounded by holy mysteries and magic sacraments, why should not the images, if worshipped, work miracles as effectively as the bones of the martyrs? This effeminate form of religion found a domicile particularly amongst women and monks. Women on the imperial throne — Irene, Theodora — helped the images to conquer, powerful soldier-emperors striving in vain to protect an enervated religion against moral collapse. At last in 842 the period of controversies concerning images closed with a festival of "orthodoxy": the orthodox person is

the person who worships the images; a heretic is one who, like Charles, King of the Franks, refuses to do so.

The Greek Church developed beyond hope of recall into a *cultus church* and a *state church*. When the rivalry between the great patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria ceased, the "œcumenical" patriarch of Constantinople lost the power of offering any resistance to the emperor. The Church, too, had lost its freedom once and for all.

The Byzantine Church, therefore, which grew from the same roots as our own Church and religion, provides us with a lesson in the history of Christianity. When in the fourteenth century the Turks with their armies were hemming in Byzantium more and more effectually, mystic monks and speculative persons were busy "gazing at the navel" in the belief that the "divine light" could best be seen in this bent attitude—"Hesychasts," they were called; that is, men of rest, in the hour when God summoned them to a state of the greatest unrest, to defend faith and fatherland in the time of direst need. This farce marks the end, as far as the Christian religion is concerned, of the boasted Greek speculation.

The practical people, with less tranquil souls, now turned to the West, ardently longing to rivet anew the chain that had been snapped. A *union* between the Western and Eastern Church was effected at Florence just before the fall of Byzantium, and a loan was negotiated at Rome.

How very different was the picture in the *West*! At the time when Islam roused itself in the East to

shatter church and empire, in the West even the distant Germanic race of the Anglo-Saxons, had been brought to own allegiance to the Catholic faith. The new peoples who made irruptions in the West were again conquered by the religion of the vanquished party, the Romans. A world of new peoples is in process of formation, containing a mingling of old and new blood, *a family of Germanic-Romanic races*, a West-European world which is beginning to realize its corporate nature and is struggling towards a new and political union; it has become a *Catholic Christendom*.

Once more all kinds of considerations may be called to our aid to explain this result. The ancient Germans were more barbaric, ruder than the Semitic Arabs; their religion, in particular, being purely pagan, did not possess that power of resistance, not to say that superiority, which was so characteristic of the strict monotheism and ardent fatalism of Islam. Indeed, while the Arabs were fully convinced of the justness of their cause, and fully assured of its victory, these Teutons, even before they had settled on the soil of the empire, had lost faith in their gods. The influence of Roman culture having long made itself felt on the boundaries of the empire even amongst the Germans, the seeds also of the new state religion had been carried over already. At the most important point, however, the work was actually complete. The leading tribes, those who were really the pioneers, the Goths, were already Christians, if Arians, when they came into the empire of the West. The Arian form of Christianity in more respects than one provided a bridge leading from



paganism to Catholic Christianity. The graduated triad, the distinct subordinationism in the divine Being, approximated to polytheism, the fact that Christ was represented as a moral hero commended itself to those who sang of their hero-kings, and much else. It was not difficult to advance a little further and accept Christianity. It is clear, then, that much can be suggested which is calculated to explain the fact that by the year 600, when the last wave of the migration of the peoples subsided with the inroad of the Langobards into Italy, or soon after the year 600, the peoples of the Western world come before us a united Catholic Christendom.

We are forced, however, to prefer the explanation that from the very first, from the time of Tertullian, and even of Clemens Romanus, the Christianity of the West was different in character from Greek Christianity, was more manly, rigid, moral and political, and that the results of this now became apparent.

We cannot say so much with regard to dogmatic controversies. Deep speculations had been left to the Orient, and theologians, making the simple law of faith, the old statements of the Apostolicon, and the ingenious formulas framed by Tertullian, their starting-ground, proceeded to deal with difficult questions from this standpoint, and by the exercise of great tact arrived at definite and final conclusions of an accommodating nature in both the Trinitarian and Christological controversies. Both zeal and energy were applied to the work of organizing constitution and discipline, and so to questions of real life. The spirit of the legal and military systems was introduced

into the Church. The system of church training represented by the discipline of penance is a product of the West, a fruit of the struggles which we have already touched upon (Chap. VI.), and which were fought out in the West. We have already seen how the growth of the hierarchical constitution was perfected through and during these struggles.

When Constantine's son, Constantius, brought the two halves of the empire under his single rule, and tried to compel the West to accept his Arianism (356), the work of theology was resumed in the West after a pause of a hundred years. The West took a prominent part in the spiritual work of that first springtide of Catholicism which followed: its best orator, Ambrose, its clearest thinker, Augustine, its most learned scholar, Jerome, belonged to these decades. It was mainly due to these men that Greek-Christian learning was now introduced into the West for the first time. Augustine, more especially, had inwardly digested the Neoplatonic philosophy, the Logos speculation, and Greek dogma, and had procured them a home in the West.

But we usually, and with good reason, apply the term "Augustinism" to another set of ideas, to doctrines of sin, and to the closely associated teaching about the Church and sacraments which represent the instruments and means by which the power of sin is broken and the gift of grace bestowed. Augustine was not the first to apply himself with burning zeal to those questions which affect religious men most deeply but which the Greeks overlooked, questions regarding the practical means of appropriating salvation; nor was he the first to give to this

zeal a new and moral purpose. A deeper sense of sin and guilt, a greater appreciation of divine grace, is to be observed since Tertullian, and this form of piety has the merit of being more closely related than the Greek form to the real gospel, the teaching that sinful man, as compared with the holy and merciful God, is like a child in the hands of its father. Here and there, especially among the Africans—it may be due to the Semitic blood of the old Carthaginians!—there is a momentary glimpse of the way that was to lead neither to hierarchy nor monasticism.

Augustine alone, who has had few equals in genius in any part of the world, in many respects pursued this path to the end, especially in his struggle against the moralistic rationalism of the monk Pelagius, in other words, of the average Catholicism, during which he was compelled to draw his own conclusions. His teaching about the sole efficacy of grace brushes the ancient intellectualism aside, breaks with moralism, makes the hierarchy unnecessary, and empties monasticism of its meaning. The germs of an entirely new theology, sown in those bitter experiences which Augustine suffered in his earlier days, were fully grown and carried over into the Middle Age.

And yet in the chapter on the origin of the hierarchy and of monasticism (Chap. VI.) we also made special reference to Augustine, and we have mentioned above the service he did in naturalizing Greek dogma. Thus, this dogma and the other statements stand side by side—though at root disparate fragments. On the one hand we find official

“Christianity,” an inheritance of ancient philosophy, and a pattern of idealistic thinking ; and on the other hand, those things which are the food and meat of the soul, an obligation to fathom the depths of the spiritual man. Both are united in the person of the great Augustine, who provided work for the intellects of succeeding centuries.

Who can deny that we find here life and strength, as well as many a task for a coming age? Like theology, monasticism also here bears a different character. There were no deserts in the West, but in their place wide stretches of provincial territory which were still pagan, and in which people were called upon to lead in the mission field a life of lonely self-denial and in a struggle with pagan passions to go to war with demons ; in their place also a distress caused by war and barbarians which summoned men to make their idealism a living force and give all the practical help they could. Martin of Tours, the national saint of Gaul, who lived as a hermit bishop, fearing neither the power of the great nor the fury of the multitude, is an example of the one kind of life ; Severinus the mysterious benefactor of the Noric people on the Danube, is an example of the other.

Finally, to mention a last prerogative of the West in comparison with the East. Its Church had found a form capable of gathering up all the forces inherent in this mode of life which was so fruitful, so rich in promise, in spite of the hardships to which it was exposed. The form assumed by the Western Church of the Middle Age is not merely Catholic, it is *Roman Catholic*.

The Romanizing of the Western Church had a

long preparation in history. When it entered upon the Middle Age, it was complete. But the second feature which distinguished the Church of the Middle Age from the old Church was the Germanic Territorial Church. The Romanized Church was in turn *Germanized*. This process we must now examine more minutely.

## IX

### RISE OF THE ROMAN MONARCHY IN THE CHURCH OF THE WEST

THE great problem presented by the rise of the papacy makes it necessary for us to look once more into the whole origin of the Catholic Church. This of itself implies that the two terms "Roman" and "Catholic" are in some way originally related. Rome had a very important share in the *development* of Catholicism.

Sohm certainly goes too far in his *Canon Law* (*Kirchenrecht*) when he supposes that the monarchical episcopate, which is the fundamental form of constitution, first arose in Rome, and as early as soon after 100. He thinks that the victory gained by this form meant a victory for Rome. But we know that Rome was anticipated in this matter by Syria and Asia Minor. In Rome the more rigid form is simply a result of the struggles in the middle of the second century. There may of course have been earlier forms, but we do not find with certainty that there was *one* president over the many heads of the college of elders until the time of Justin (*circa* 150).

But as soon as the form was adopted here, it must have instantly, so to say, acquired an importance very

different from that which attached to it elsewhere. At the outset Rome possessed two advantages over the other churches. In the first place, it was the capital of the world, the city of the Cæsars, brilliant and "eternal" Rome. As a city it possessed, as it still possesses, a charm of its own. Long had it been the political and social centre of the world! Pliny and Strabo already felt that Nature had predestined Rome to rule over the Mediterranean and the adjoining lands of Asia, Africa, and Europe. Here was the seat of government; from this city the people received laws, and the lines of communication ran out into the whole world. Here was the great school of politics; here took place an interchange of thoughts, languages, customs, of spiritual and material wares of every description, such as has no parallel. In the second place—and this is a matter of peculiar interest to Christians—the importance of Rome brought Paul and Peter to the city. The Eternal City was honoured in containing the graves of the two martyrs. In all probability they had fallen victims to the first fatal collision between the Roman world-power and the Christian world-religion, a sign of the great battle that was to rage amongst the following generations. Jesus' foremost disciples went to the heart of the empire to place themselves at the service of the people, just as the Master Himself, and for the same purpose, had gone to the capital of Palestine. Legend represents that John, the third great apostle, also visited Rome, and was there plunged in boiling oil. We can understand to what an extent the imagination must have been fired by truth and fiction alike! "Happy

the church," says Tertullian with enthusiasm, "upon which the apostles poured the whole flood of their teaching as well as their blood!" Peter and Paul were soon made founders of the Church, in spite of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and not long afterwards Peter's name appeared at the head of the list of bishops of Rome. Ultimately, though not until the fourth century, he was assigned (according to Jerome) a rule of twenty-five years.

If Rome was thus early consecrated to be the treasury of the best tradition, we must recall in this connection what Irenæus said about the year 180 in an utterance which has become famous and is in a certain sense the first relating to the primacy of Rome: "In this, the chief city of the world, the oldest and greatest of the churches of the apostles, is accumulated the witness of all believers, so to say; every church must agree with it in virtue of its position of principal authority (*potentior principalitas*)." This means no less than that the Roman view is a standard representing the general view; in other words, it is the *Catholic view par excellence*. And indeed we have already found that in strict accordance with this the *Roman* baptismal confession became the symbol of the Church, and the *Roman* collection of sacred Scriptures the canon of the whole Church. The Church derived rule of faith and canon from Rome; our "Apostolicon" and our New Testament were in all probability compiled in Rome.

If, then, the *bishops* in general were regarded as securities for and guardians of tradition, the *Roman* bishop was the protector of that splendid Roman



tradition which excelled all others in age and general esteem. His dignity must have increased rapidly! The tradition was traced back through the line of earlier bishops of the apostolic churches to the Lord Himself who had given the apostles the *potestas evangelii*, or an official commission to preach the gospel; in Rome it was carried back directly to Peter. Very soon, by working backwards to the first bishop, to whom the bishop who was ruling at the time stood in the relationship of vicar or representative, the gaps were filled up and a list of bishops with fixed names was compiled. The position was supported and made use of by men of striking personality. Victor of Rome at the end of the second century became the first "Pope." In the controversy regarding the Easter festival he appealed to his better tradition and opposed it to the only tradition which could enter the lists against Rome, that of Asia Minor, which was supposed to be derived from John; on the plea that there must be unity, as represented by Rome, he excommunicated the people of Asia Minor, and, though his action was fiercely opposed, he prevailed in the end.

At the beginning of the third century, in the reigns of Septimius Severus and Caracalla, and at a time when the empire was making the greatest progress towards a centralized state of loyal subjects with its centre in Rome, the second "pope" lived there; this was Calixtus, the man with an obscure past, to whom we referred in dealing with the history of discipline. Tertullian, in bitterness and contempt, addresses him in the words with which Calixtus grandiloquently described himself: "Pontifex maximus, benedictus

papa, episcopus episcoporum, apostolicus." We met with him again in the history of the constitution. This same Calixtus laboured at a complete development of the idea of an official hierarchy. He was the first to claim that the office possessed an "inviolable character," just as he was the first to teach that sinners were part of the endowment of the Church; the one holy thing, in his opinion, was the divine regulation of the Church, invested in the holders of this office. At this stage, again, Rome had the most important share in the development by which this second chief advance in the unity of the Church was made; according to this, the Church is reared on the *bishops*; the Church is the collective body, the unity, of the bishops, and not merely the collective body, the united brotherly alliance, of the churches. Cyprian of Carthage, both in his actions and in his treatise "On the Unity of the Catholic Church," in large measure relied upon what had been done by Rome, particularly by Calixtus.

But the form which Calixtus gave to this second feature in the development, the idea of a purely *hierarchical* church, was of course not the same as that intended by Calixtus. From the first the idea of the "one general (Catholic) Church" divided, so to say, in proportion as emphasis was laid on the "una" or the "catholica," on a comprehensive unity, or a uniform generality. The "divine right" of the bishop was established by saying that the bishops are the official successors of the twelve apostles, to whom, according to Matt. xviii. 18, the Lord gave the power of the keys, and according to John xx. 22, the Holy Spirit; thus they are the lords of the Church

in both a juristic and dogmatic sense, forming together and conjointly a Christian aristocracy. Such is Cyprian's conception of the Church. There may, indeed, be more prominent episcopal sees in the metropolitan cities—for instance, in such centres of the empire as Alexandria, Antioch, and especially Rome—but this makes no difference to the principle; in principle they are all equal, and even Rome enjoys no more than a precedence in honour, being *primus* but only *inter pares*, first among equals. Such is *uniform generality*.

But there was another passage earlier in date and more solemn in character, Matt. xvi. 18 f., in which Peter is set apart from the rest of the disciples, and in which it is promised that upon this disciple of rock a Church of Christ shall be built against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. It has been conjectured that the verse is a very early interpolation designed to support the idea of the primacy of Rome. In support of this view weighty considerations can certainly be adduced. In that case it must have been inserted in the second century at the time when expression was first being given to the claims of Rome, and presents one feature of Rome's aspirations, the first all-important and portentous example of Rome's practice of first inventing the basis of its claims and then supporting them with all the semblance of antiquity. Calixtus already appeals to this passage, and, as far as we know, he was the first to do so; Tertullian, in opposing him, does not express any doubt as to the passage itself, but only as to the explanation which the Roman gives of it. On the strength of this saying of the Lord more

particularly, Calixtus issued a peremptory edict, or an edict binding on the whole Church, concerning matters of discipline, and so much in favour of those who had fallen into sins of the flesh that they were not allowed to be excluded for ever from communion. In this way the position is reversed: among the apostles we have a prince of apostles, in whose dignity the others may at most share, though he is ordained to be over them; and corresponding to this, among the bishops we find a prince who is no longer ranked by the side of the other bishops, but above them in virtue of a *peculiar* divine right which he possesses as the direct representative of Peter, Christ, and God, *servus servorum*, yet *dominus dominorum*; like Christ Himself, servant of all yet Lord of all. Such is *comprehensive unity*!

Thus we have side by side those two theories, the friction between which so agitated the inward life of the Catholic Church down to the year 1870, and the collision between which at times so violently shook the building, which in fact helped to introduce the Reformation: the episcopal system or the primate system, or, as was said later, when the papal prince held a Court, the curial system, an aristocracy and an absolute monarchy.

Which of the two ideas was the stronger, the more compelling? The writings of Ignatius of Antioch at the beginning of the second century owe their charm in large measure to the great enthusiasm with which he speaks of his ideal, the *unity* of the episcopal office: "A bishop is like an altar; he is the one representative of the one Lord, Christ." Like a prophet, Ignatius, when he died, left behind him this ideal of

unity. The words were only spoken of the individual church, but could not the facts which in a narrower circle favoured the co-ordination or, if we may be allowed the expression, the corporealization of the individual church, be applied once more at a later date when it became a question of the strict co-ordination of all the individual churches into one great Church of Christ? If it was thought that people needed the support of outward forms of constitution, in order to hold the spirit, was not a greater measure of support now provided both inwardly and outwardly when people actually organized themselves in a manner suggested by the state and its army? After the Council of Nicæa the Church had, it is true, a visible guide, the œcumenical council, but apart from the fact that the assembly really included for the most part only the bishops of the East, it was a guide with many heads. Would not the impression be far more reliable and effective, far more clear and unquestionable, if a general effort was made to render the invisible power visible, to find this power in *a single person*, rather than in a synod which, involving as it did a division into majorities and minorities, only too often presented a deplorable spectacle? Is not the papacy—by which we mean the infallible and absolute papacy—the most logical and therefore most complete form of Catholicism, of Christianity organized on the lines of the political and military system? We Protestants are too apt to fall into the mistake of regarding the substance of other confessions too superficially, of not going deep enough into the matter. The opponent of the papacy must first realize the meaning of this great idea of unity, and

in the second place must not think of beginning, as Luther did, by attacking the papacy of the Middle Age, which was a contradiction of the genuine thing.

The Roman primacy had not of course come to be generally accepted in the ancient Church. But the idea was clearly gaining ground. Even Cyprian admits that symbolical expression may have been given to the idea of the unity of the Church in the saying of the Lord to Peter preserved in Matt. xvi. This of course would mean that the idea was already found in the New Testament. Again, in the following centuries, the natural course of events led to the many leaders being reduced to a few, the aristocracy to an oligarchy. Out of a number of bishops of equal standing a few rose above the common level and attained greater power; thus we find chief metropolitans, who were now called patriarchs, such as the bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, and Byzantium, and others. Their position was recognized by the state, and large portions of the empire were put under them, the empire having been newly divided into "dioceses." Thus the apex of the system was narrowed—to such an extent, indeed, that ultimately in the fifth century the only rivalry that really remains is between the three sees, Alexandria, Rome, and Byzantium, and of these, properly speaking, only Alexandria and Rome were left in possession of the field. The great Alexandrines, Athanasius, Theophilus, Cyril, Dioscurus, were truly, as Harnack has said, great popes such as were to be found only at Rome.

And why not the patriarchs of Byzantium? Did they not take part in the struggle with Alexandria?

Might not the emperor allow them ascendancy over the others? Was it not, in fact, the help of the emperor that meant victory in the struggle with the Alexandrines? The truth is, that this apparent assistance, which for a time was real, proved in the end a source of weakness. The loan contracted with the political power certainly meant that the *Church* was renouncing the principal rôle which it had played. At a later date, when the papacy had become an unquestioned fact, there sprang up that fable of the "gift of Constantine," according to which the great emperor presented Bishop Sylvester at Rome with the whole of the West, while he himself discreetly withdrew to the East. The story was invented to explain this success, and shows, as regards Rome, what great importance was very properly attached to the transference of the political centre to the East. From the time of Constantine the Roman bishop, at least in the West, might expect much less opposition to be offered to his claims; moreover, since he was already *ecclesiastical* ruler in Rome, he might gradually come to feel that he was also ruler of the world. When later still, at the end of the fourth century, the empire was finally divided into two, and the city which had already served as the residence of the Western Augustus, Milan, was made the seat of Western government, as soon afterwards Ravenna, Rome was still reserved for the popes.

Rome enjoyed a kind of primacy in the West, even before the connection with the East was quite broken, not in the colourless sense in which the idea had long been accepted, but in a juristic sense. At

the end of the fourth century, when Siricius was bishop of Rome, papal legislation commenced, that is to say, the letters of the Roman bishops began to assume the force of law, at least in the West.

The barbarians were now knocking at the gates of the empire. In their dire distress people began to look to Rome for deliverance. During the decades from Alaric to Attila the theory of the absolute monarchy of the popes was completed, and in a large measure was converted into practice. This was chiefly due to the powerful personality of Pope Leo I. the Great (440-461); an ancient narrative tells us that he succeeded in persuading King Attila—so famous in legends—to turn his back on Rome. Bringing together the three sayings of the Lord to Peter, Matt. xvi. 18 (“Thou art Peter,” etc.), John xxi. 15-17 (“Feed my lambs”), and Luke xxii. 32 (“But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith may not fail”), he based upon them the claim that the successor of Peter has supreme power over the other bishops—he alone was the vicar of Christ called to “a full measure of power”; the metropolitans are simply *his* vicars appointed to feed a portion of the flock. It was now that there first appeared—less important forgeries having preceded it—that spurious addition to the sixth canon of Nicæa: “The Roman Church has always enjoyed the primacy.” This seemed to be the time to explain again the past in accordance with the present, and to obtain recognition of Roman supremacy from the most holy Synod of Nicæa, that most famous example of the rival instrument of ecclesiastical unification, the œcumenical council held in the second classical



period of the Church, the age of Constantine. Even more important than the victory gained over Alexandria at Chalcedon (451) with the help of Byzantium, was the humiliation brought upon the Gallic power that gathered round the archbishop's see at Arles and strove for mastery. For the position of the Western world, which as time went on became more and more independent, and the unconditional rule over this, were matters of the first importance. Appeal is first made to this spurious canon of Nicæa in an edict issued by the Western Emperor Valentinian III. in 445 on the occasion of this struggle between Rome and Arles, and in favour of the former.

This happened seven years before Attila's inroad into Italy. The legend which tells of the meeting between Leo and the king of the Huns is very instructive. All that is left of the ancient world takes refuge with the pope in its flight from the barbarians, and yet this barbarian does obeisance to him, and in his person to the ancient world. Here we have a parable! Of course there was not much of the ancient world left; but what remained in Gaul, Spain, Italy, the Alpine districts, and even in Africa, saw in Rome its last safe refuge: over this remnant Leo ruled as a true pope. The more troubles increased, and the more irresistible the inundation by foreign tribes became, the more closely did people attach themselves to Rome and the Church of Rome. When at the beginning of the fifth century the Visigoth Alaric was approaching Rome, we see from the hymns of the Christian poet Prudentius that Roman national feeling was now for the first time clinging

to the Church, the political pride of Rome uniting with reverence for the chair of Peter ; at the end of this century the political power of Rome vanished altogether. Throughout the provinces the towns containing a Roman population stood forth like islands in a Germanic ocean, the bishops inheriting the political power. On the other hand, all these Roman elements, scattered as they were and controlled by Germanic masters, looked in the direction of Rome, in which they possessed their last and only form of unity, that of the spirit. The power and dignity of the papal throne were extending far beyond the limits of a merely ecclesiastical domain.

Attila halts before Rome, *the heiress of the ancient world!* We cannot say that the Christian spirit of the West had previously received its stamp only in Rome. The most noteworthy Fathers of the Church, Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine, belonged, not to Rome, but to Africa. Milan owned the great Ambrose, monasticism established itself mainly in Southern Gaul, where in the fifth century people rejoiced in a second spring-tide of learning. But now Rome represented the ancient world in a Christian sense. All the aspirations and all the glory of pagan and Christian times were entwined about it. Rome must surely be holy, exempt from human judgment, and therefore infallible ! The idea was first expressed by the Italian Bishop Ennodius in the time of the Ostrogoth Théodoric. *Gregory the Great*, the last of the Church Fathers, who was born of a distinguished Roman family and was first a city prefect, then a monk, in the year 600 sums up, so to say, the importance of Rome's position by saying that it was

an inheritance from the ancient world. Of course there was much that was of an extraneous and degenerate nature ; the theology of Gregory himself, for instance, is poor as compared with the speculative power of the classical Fathers. Nevertheless, so much of the Augustinian theology as was handed on to the Middle Age is Gregorian in character. He it was who transmitted the principles of church training, administration, and politics, even the technical part of the cultus, to the new ages ; in him we see an embodiment of those features which made Western piety, thoroughly monasticized though it was, superior to all Greek forms. It was now conceivable that a life of rigid abstinence might lead to the papal throne. In Gregory the monk and pope, avoidance of the world and dominion over the world, were united in a memorable way.

Thus the Catholic Church of the West with which the Germanic peoples became acquainted was a *Roman Catholic Church*, a *Romanized Church*.

## X

### THE GERMANIC TERRITORIAL (NATIONAL, IMPERIAL) CHURCHES

ALL that remained of church and empire was Roman. Only ruins, of course, were left. In the interval between Leo and Gregory the Western world had been partitioned anew. The future of Roman Catholicism could be assured only if the new peoples were won over to the faith. Full of new blood, and possessing a power of reproduction which was well-nigh inexhaustible, these were bound to assimilate and incorporate all the Roman and Celtic population that remained, wherever they settled on the soil of the Roman empire, though the old and the new inhabitants might at first and for some time exist side by side as distinct castes. But these had not the whole share in the development of the future; other participators were the tribes who settled in *Germania barbara*, and were no longer cut off by a rampart resembling the Chinese Wall from the people of their own blood who had become inhabitants of Roman territory.

The Romanizing of the West, so far as the Church was concerned, was inevitable as soon as the Germanic peoples looked with favour upon this

form of Catholicism. This, however, involved the adoption of the second of the two features noted above; the Catholic Church entered into sympathy with the spirit peculiar to these new peoples; it became *Germanized*.

An event of equal importance at least to that of Constantine's conversion to Christianity occurred when Clovis, King of the Salic Franks, at the end of the fifth century bent his proud head, probably at Rheims, to receive baptism from the Catholic bishop. The equal significance of both events greatly impressed the Frank historian, Gregory of Tours, and we may with good reason suspect that the oldest and legendary accounts of the conversion of Clovis at the battle with the Alamanni was suggested by the famous story of Constantine's fight at the Milvian Bridge. We may even think that the event was greater. The old and the new world greeted each other; the blessing which the Church bestowed upon the prince of the barbarians included all the blessings of ancient civilization. Christianity, moreover, seemed to be born again. There was no need to revive the old struggle between Christianity and paganism.

All the experiences, all the circumstances of Constantine, had led him to the path which he pursued. Clovis decided in a more independent way to act as he did; he was not impelled to the same extent by inward feeling and outward circumstance. He had other weapons of new and strong metal—his people. But of course in the one case, as in the other, diplomacy was a guiding principle; it led Clovis to become a Christian—a Catholic and a Roman Christian.

The explanation usually given is that Clovis allied himself with the discontented Roman provincials in the principalities of his Burgundian and Gothic neighbours, who were Arians, and whose kingdom he wished to possess; since, however, the Roman element was Catholic, he himself became Catholic. But this is not the end of the matter. Kings of the Goths, Suevi, Vandals, had marched into their new countries at the head of their tribes as warrior-kings; accordingly, when the king and his warrior-people settled down, they ruled as far as the tribe extended, however thin the layer. Thus arose national kingdoms. Clovis was not merely a warrior-king: he did not found a national kingdom, he was a conqueror. His people pushed forward simply as colonists to the Somme; though a German, he ruled as conqueror in Middle and North-West Gaul over a purely Celtic-Roman, a Romanic population. He went farther, and proceeded to conquer the neighbouring Germanic kingdoms set up on Gallic territory. When he died, Gaul was again in process of becoming a corporate body, but it was only the will and control of the king that held this "Frankish kingdom" together. He must have felt that his interests were bound up with the population which was native to all parts of Gaul, the older, Romanic layer. If these people possessed in the Catholic form of Christianity cherished by Rome a spiritual bond of union—and how powerful this was we have already seen—if they had in the organization of the Catholic hierarchy a massive chain which nothing could break, this connection with Rome must be made use of as a means of uniting the new kingdom of his

own which he had started. And more than this: Clovis himself made a section of the Alamanni, and the Franks along the banks of the Rhine, his subjects; his sons added, besides Burgundy, another great section of the pagan tribes on the other side of the Rhine in Middle and South Germany. Clotaire I. about the year 560 ruled a united kingdom which stretched from the Pyrenees to Austria and from the North Sea to the maritime Alps and the Mediterranean: it included the most diverse elements, and received a universal colouring. The general religion which this kingdom was obliged to seek, Christianity, would be most serviceable if it assumed a universal, general, Catholic form, not a national and restricted form such as that of Arianism, which only created tribal churches which, though of a national character, were not closely knit together. The extensive Merovingian kingdom and the Catholic Church were seeking one another, and went half-way to meet one another.

Last, but not least, there was the great moral impression made by the Catholic Church on the minds of the barbarians: the glory of the world which had perished was reflected on her face. A superior civilization overpowered them. Here the Germans found the technical arts: how to manage an estate in a rational way, cultivate a garden, construct an aqueduct, and work a factory. Here an astonishing intellectual wealth disclosed itself. A change now took place which has an important bearing on all the events that followed. The distinction between clergy and laity assumes an entirely new character; it is not the same as it was in the

ancient Church: the clergy are the cultured, the laity the uncultured class. *It is the Church that possesses general culture*, including the arts of reading and writing, and, broadly speaking, all art and science, even the knowledge of law and of the purely secular branches of politics. Religion formed the bridge by which the Germans advanced, as others had done before, from a state of barbarism to one of culture. Soon more and more Catholic bishops bear Frank names. Latins and Franks, through the connecting link of the Church, became a *united* people even in the domain of culture. But the Church retained a monopoly.

The methods of the Franks, who acted as pioneers, and the superiority inherent in the Roman Catholic Church, show how it was that the Germanic tribes which still remained outside the united kingdom of the Franks, the Suevi and Visigoths in Spain, the Lombards in Italy, the Anglo-Saxons in Britain, inherited the Roman Catholic form of Christianity. The former abandoned Arianism; a Catholic Spain appeared at the end of the sixth century, a Catholic Italy in the course of the seventh. The latter, the pagan Anglo-Saxons, had come into contact with that form of Christianity which had developed amongst the Celtic Britons, Scots and Picts in Wales, Ireland and Scotland, even before the far-sighted Gregory the Great started his mission policy in this quarter. The statement which we made at an earlier point, to the effect that the whole of the Western Church was Romanized by the year 600, must be qualified a little as regards the Celtic Church. The Christianity which arose in this island-province, so remote, so severed, as



it were, from the main body of the empire, such a stranger to the spiritual movement on the Continent, was indeed Catholic orthodox Christianity, but it was in a peculiar way partly stunted and partly abnormally developed. It had not shared that high state of development reached by Rome; it had not developed a hierarchy; what it had developed, and that in a very one-sided fashion, was the system of monasticism which it had derived from Gaul. A monastic church had arisen with remarkable, and in some measure very disturbing, practices of its own, such as a different method of fixing the Easter festival, and consequently a different calendar, with an unusually strict system of discipline, a different kind of penance, which afterwards had an important bearing on the origin of indulgence.

We cannot be surprised that the general church, which culminated in the monarchy of Rome and was so perfectly organized, should have triumphed over this remote and stationary church. The Celtic Church deserves our sympathy, but its lack of organization made it radically weak and deprived it of the power of government. The crisis was precipitated in Britain itself in the seventh century—and in a very striking way. When the Irishman, Colman, abbot of the leading monastery of Lindisfarne, wishing to find support for the practices of his church, appealed to the apostle John, just as the church of Asia Minor had done in the second century in support of its method of reckoning Easter in reply to Victor of Rome, the young Anglo-Saxon Wilfrid, who had been in Rome, pointed out that Peter is the gatekeeper who has the keys of heaven,

and admits people only as he pleases. This made the king of Northumbria fear that he might be excluded. It was a more powerful kind of argument than Victor had been able to use, being, in fact, a drastic and practical application of the theory of Leo. And Wilfrid became a great bishop of York. Only weak survivals of the old Celtic provincial church perpetuated themselves independently down to the twelfth century.

On the whole, we may say that at the beginning of the seventh century the victory of the Roman type of Catholic Church was fully assured in the West, though large portions of the empire were far from having been thoroughly Christianized, especially the German tribes of Austrasia.

In the letter of congratulation which Bishop Avitus of Vienne sent to King Clovis on the occasion of his baptism, he had shown a truly prophetic outlook: he saw in it an act of the greatest significance, not only as affecting his own Frank principality, but also as involving the Christianizing and Catholicizing of the rest of the Western world, "of peoples dwelling afar off, who continue in the ignorance of nature, but have not as yet been corrupted by the dissemination of false doctrine"; he saw in the West a new light burning at the Frank court, a centre of Christian life emerging, such as was found at the imperial court of Byzantium in the East. The first "Louis" of France earned the title of "the most Christian king."

It is very instructive to compare the efforts made by Clovis's brother-in-law, Theodoric, the king of the Ostrogoths. He also wished to found a great

state on the ruins of the old one, with the help of the new forces inherent in the Germanic peoples. The large collection of documents written by his Roman chancellor Cassiodorus and preserved to us, show how he was able to bring Goths and Romans under one system of government, and discloses his policy of a pan-Germanic alliance. But since his warrior hosts were settled in Italy and he was working from the centre, he thought it absolutely necessary to keep Goths and Romans apart, both religiously and socially. He and his people remained Arians. But even if the Ostrogoths had succeeded in effectually breaking the connection with Byzantium, and Belisarius and Narses, Justinian's commanders, had not proved victorious over them, the undertaking would have had no prospect of success. The artificial barriers which he tried to raise would inevitably have fallen sooner or later, as they afterwards did in the case of the Lombards, and the Ostrogoths would have been absorbed and Romanized like their Visigothic brothers. They had to some extent introduced new blood; but there was not sufficient power to found a new empire, to rejuvenate an ancient world. We know how greatly Theodoric feared that his Gothic warriors would rapidly become enervated; we know how disastrous in the provinces was the effect of Roman culture upon the Germans. The Germanic multitudes which had come in with Theodoric had no reserves, no natural means of reinforcement; they were a mass of people torn and uprooted from their ancient soil, and in the end were doomed to crumble to pieces.

The kingdom, however, which Avitus with his

keen vision saw springing up from North Gaul to enter into the inheritance of ancient Rome was founded by a settled people which only gradually pushed its multitudes forward from the Lower Rhine, and always had behind it the broad country of the still untamed German tribes. It will always seem a remarkable fact that the very tribe which settled nearest to the Salians—we mean the Saxons—retained its independence and preserved its peculiar character intact longer than any other ; a magnificent reserve force kept for the time when peradventure other tribes might have spent their power. The German tribes of Austrasia, in fact, saved the empire of the Franks, both internally and externally, in the eighth century, and it was they who in the ninth and tenth centuries reconstructed it.

If, then, as we have already stated, Franks and Romans were made a united people by the connecting bonds of the Church, the *new empire* that arose, remained, and could not help remaining, under all circumstances a *Germanic* empire. Rome did not swallow up or destroy the Germanic element, nor in the present case did the conquering nation adopt the religion of the conquered without changing its forms and even influencing it deeply. *The Romanized Church was in its turn Germanized.*

When Constantine recognized the Church, he wished to rule it ; when Clovis allied himself with the Catholic provincial church, he wished to make use of it. He expected its forces to come to his help ; consequently, he must be lord over the church of his land, his expanding kingdom. Both the will of the ruler and the inevitable trend of circumstances

produced an interchange and close union between the secular and spiritual power, closer than any known to the ancient Church. Even in the Roman dominions the Church had to a greater and greater extent become the owner of landed property, and the clergy a wealthy class. Now the Teutons were agriculturists. Exchange again reverts to the more primitive form of barter in kind. A sense of piety, a peculiar leaning towards "mildness" and generosity, a superstition, a feeling that the outbreaks of an unbridled passion must be atoned for by reparation equal to the offence, prompted the Teutons to make lavish gifts to the Church. The Crown pointed the way. Here, however, in the Church alone could such landed possessions be wisely managed and increased, the Church having inherited greater skilfulness in administration. In her "dead hand" land increased enormously. While Gregory I. was now laying the foundation of the "Church State," the *Patrimonium Petri*, in Italy by organizing extensive estates belonging to the Roman bishops, the Church everywhere, as represented by its bishoprics and abbeys, its parishes and chapels, was becoming the possessor of landed property, a great landlord. The Church, which was originally in the provinces, as in Italy, more deeply rooted in the towns, now becomes rural. The bishops, now partly drawn from leading Frankish families, place themselves on a level with the landed nobility, even on a higher level: the two chief classes in the community are now clergy and nobility.

This was the case everywhere in Spain, England, Upper Italy; in the Frank Merovingian kingdom

the development was specially important. *The King* could not hesitate to use and make himself master of these landed estates. He might perhaps be averse to bringing any influence to bear upon the Church's internal affairs as regards legislation and doctrine—though in this age of transition these were very little in evidence—but he could himself even less than the Roman emperor refuse to deal with matters of a public and judicial nature. *The Merovingian monarch* summoned the synods of his kingdom, and chose the bishops or had a voice in their election; to him they were obliged to swear allegiance. In principle, even the clergy had to submit to the state system of penal and civil justice, to pay taxes and perform military duties; if they were exempted it was due to royal favour. On the other hand, the bishoprics and monasteries with their landed possessions could not dispense with that state protection under which the Church lived even in Roman times, and the less so in days when public affairs were insecure. And now the barbarians had again introduced a state of affairs in which not peace but war was presupposed, and was even regarded as the normal thing! Thus the whole existence of the Church is bound up with the state, the land, and the nation. Science and art decline rapidly; the collision between barbarism and an over-refined civilization involves a brutalizing of morals; gross material interests everywhere get the upper hand.

*The Catholic Germanic territorial churches* of the Merovingian period are a Lombard, a Visigoth, an Anglo-Saxon, and a Frank church, the latter being even more, an imperial church, though only one

by the side of others, particular sections striving to form smaller territorial churches within it. Thus at the beginning of the eighth century an effort was made by the Agilolfings to start a Bavarian national church. The arrangements in these territorial churches were patterns for the whole of the Middle Age—even as regards the ages which have still to be dealt with.

Does not the expression “Catholic,” that is to say, general—“national church,” that is to say, particular church, involve a contradiction? It does if both ideas develop in a strictly logical way, if the territorial church develops into a state church, and an effort is made to unite closely the Church to the state as its servant, and if Catholic is taken to imply, as Rome claimed that it did, a rigid form of unity with a levelling tendency. In other words, then, *Rome and the Germanic territorial churches are secretly opposed to one another*. The king cannot, and will not, allow outside interference in his church, or suffer its affairs to be managed in accordance with a general scheme which is none of his making. Even if his church were only a purely spiritual power, it had in it elements of great danger, but since it was a great land-owner, the first source of taxation, and since its clergy were the most powerful class in the community, it could not be permitted to introduce foreign elements into his kingdom. And, on the other hand, in view of the fact that the Church was both secular and spiritual, any attempt on the part of Rome to issue commands in spiritual matters which should bind the consciences of men everywhere, and so to interfere with the absolute power of a monarch,

would at once react upon secular matters which were closely associated.

People were obliged to compromise continually, to make abatements in Rome's claims; a real state church and a real curial system are irreconcilable. It was actually in the Frank kingdom that the power of Gregory the Great found its limits. He conceived the idea of binding the Anglo-Saxon Church to Rome in a new way. But reverently as this people looked to Rome, making pilgrimages thither and being the first to pay Peter's pence, to support the Schola Saxonica at the papal see, here, where Anglo-Saxon principality and episcopal diocese exactly coincided, it seemed from the first a matter of course that the king should appoint the bishops, confirm the decisions of the synods, and pass sentence on the clergy: king's law took precedence of bishop's law. The Frank as well as the Anglican Church, both Gallicanism and Anglicanism, from the first claimed exemptions from the rule of Rome.

The successors of Gregory the Great, in spirit as in name, Gregory II. and III., eminent representatives of Rome's aspirations in the first half of the eighth century, thought they could educate the *Germans* and make them a tractable people. Through the Anglo-Saxon Winfrid or Boniface there was to be formed a direct connection with Rome, in spite of the power of the king of the Franks. But at this very time the sire of the Carolingians, Charles Martel, was awakening the kingdom of the Franks from its torpor. And if Pope Gregory gave Boniface a commission, the alert Charles Martel made the execution of it subject to



his own consent, so that he soon perceived that he was serving two masters.

Charles Martel was not a spiritual man; the moral force was on the side of the pope. But when his sons Carloman and Pippin devoted themselves in a whole-hearted way to the twofold task of reforming the Church and promoting missionary enterprise, while at the same time the new pope, Zacharias, bungled and temporized, the Anglo-Saxon Boniface decided to choose between his two masters and serve the king, following the example of his native church, though he retained the very highest respect for the moral dignity of Rome. The Church resigned even the control of its internal affairs to the king—administration, discipline and customs, even its belief.

The energy of Boniface brought the Roman form of Christianity into favour even in the German portions of the kingdom; the armed mission of Charles the Great won over the defiant Saxons as well, from the Rhine to the Eider, that is to say, North Germany, to the Roman Catholic form of Christianity, and with the same objects a start was made in Christianizing the Western and Southern Slavs. Europe, in so far as it confessed the name of Christ, in alliance with Rome! Throughout Germany the Irish mission was repulsed. It shared with its native church an incapacity for organization. Rome, on the other hand, had a special capacity for organization. The Carolingians made use of it.

In the reign of Pippin, whose accession merely introduced a new variation of the circumstances we have sketched above, and in the reign of his great son Charles, the Germanization also was completed.

Not only was their territorial or imperial church inseparably dovetailed into the state, to which they added a new security—Pippin brushed aside even Boniface—but they also extended their kingdom, and with it their ecclesiastico-political principles, to new districts, Italy, and the northern and Christian part of Spain. With the exception of Southern Italy and England, with which there was at least close spiritual sympathy, the whole of the Christian West is not only Roman, but even Frank, and though Rome was at the extreme southern edge of the kingdom, it was a Frank city, its bishop, the pope, a Frank imperial bishop, his patrimonium a portion of the Frank imperial territory and imperial church.

Romanization and Germanization—these are the two characteristics of the Catholic Church of the West in the Middle Age! Both were completed in the same decades of the eighth century. But the completion seemed of necessity to involve a conflict between the Roman sacerdotium and the German imperium. Provisionally the last word had been spoken by the latter.

## XI

### IMPERIUM AND SACERDOTIUM FROM CHARLES THE GREAT TO INNOCENT III.

CHARLES'S biographer Einhard relates that the king of the Franks on that Christmas day of the year 800, as he knelt in prayer before the altar in St Peter's Church, was to his surprise confronted by Pope Leo III., who held out a golden crown and placed it on the head of the Frank while the Roman people were heard shouting with joy, as they were wont to do when they greeted their Roman Cæsars, "Life and victory to Charles Augustus, the great and peace-loving emperor of the Romans, who has been crowned by God." The idea—favoured by Albert Hauck, the distinguished exponent of German Church History—that Charles had no intention of reviving the dignity of emperor, is not tenable. The surprise which he felt can only have concerned the day and the nature of the appearance. There can be no doubt that he himself wished to place the crown on his head.

In the year 794 Charles held a general Synod of the West at Frankfort-on-the-Main for the purpose of dealing with a Christological controversy and the

dispute about images. It was an imitation of the œcumenical synod of the ancient and Eastern style and of the part played by the emperor in it: Charles presided, and standing in front of the throne, explained the question in dispute, decided the matter, and announced the decision. He wished to outdo the Synod of the East held in the year 787, and he decreed in a far more impressive way the opposite of what was then decided. The pope, though his opinion was different, submitted. The "Caroline Books," which in their main lines give the emperor's own opinion, are full of conceit and self-consciousness in their references to the Orient and Byzantium, and their subject-matter shows to how great an extent this attitude was justified. The "King of Byzantium," as Charles pointedly asserts, had ventured without consulting him, the "ruler of Germany, Gaul, Italy, and the surrounding provinces," to summon what he called an œcumenical council; to finally supplant this rival and obliterate the memory of him in the West, there was no other means, or at any rate no more effective means, than to re-establish the imperium of the West in a new and independent form.

The pope anointed him, the Church blessed him. There was again a *holy* Roman empire, if of a Germanic nation. But a much more holy one than that of old, because in this case, in accordance with the facts we have adduced, the threads of the state were more firmly interwoven with those of the Church and religion, the result being a divine state or *theocracy*. This was the ideal which Charles cherished in his heart, and which was now put into practice. Alcuin calls him a priest and a

preacher, the deputy of Peter; Theodulf of Orleans even described him as the vicar of Christ and God; in the intimate circle of his own academy, however, he designated himself the theocratic king of Israel, David, who became a pattern for all kings.

He was really able in large measure to accomplish the task suggested by this description. He felt, as Constantine, and to some extent Clovis, did before him, that, the Church having become the general and Catholic Church, should be made his chief instrument, the foundation, in fact, of his government, and the bond that should unite his empire, even though it was *Roman Catholic*. The unity of the Church, which was so desirable, could be more precisely gathered up in the person of the one pope; for him, as for Cyprian, the pope might symbolically represent this unity, and might prove to be a convenient weapon to use against Byzantium—but of course only a pope who did not himself dream of becoming master of the world. He must continue to possess a purely spiritual authority, being relegated to the position of an intermediating high priest; further, he was a subject, if the chief subject, of the emperor to whom he swore allegiance, who had judicial power over him; who ratified his appointment, and without whose permission he was not allowed to leave Rome.

These days of Charles the Great, of the first Renaissance, of the first real coalition between the Christian Germanic and the ancient genius, have a peculiar charm of their own. A master-organizer, Charles understood how to instil the ideas that were cherished at his court into the minds of individual

pastors, and even of the people. A humane, ethical and religious form of culture, starting from these quarters, spread in equal measure over the various portions of the kingdom. This was the real and higher work of this short-lived revival—a new Europe, a Europe created out of these diverse elements, to plunge in equal measure for a time into the stream of the Carolingian renaissance, and, by so doing, to promote everywhere, in some degree at least, a community of goods as regards the treasures of culture. Only one man has been confronted with a similar task, Napoleon I., who himself often appealed to the case of Charles the Great. All the Christian peoples who stood on the threshold of the Middle Age shared and were united by the memory of a great personality, the person of Charles the Great.

Only during his reign and so long as he lived was there in the Middle Age a Western imperialism, an imperium which effectually united the Christians of the West, and deserved to bear the name. What was so described at a later date was an ideal fiction which purported to continue the empire of Charles and the old emperors. As a matter of fact, the collapse of the empire began immediately after Charles's death, in the reigns of his son and grandsons: and in the year 843, hardly a generation afterwards, it split asunder into France, Germany, and Italy. What became of the Church which had here coalesced in the closest manner with the theocracy, just as in ancient times it had proved the instrument of unity and a united civilization? When the collapse came, it was the Frank imperial church which in a spasmodic

way, and in some respects in opposition to the pope, clung to the great idea of a united empire, because in it the bishops saw a guarantee and an embodiment of the idea of a united Christendom as well. Not until the battle of Fontenay in the year 841 brought a divine judgment upon the emperor Lothair did the Church retreat *en masse*. And whither? Did it split up among the national churches, as the kingdom did into nations, or did it find another safeguard for its unity? Did it, too, follow the separatist tendencies of the age, or, now that it could no longer find unity in a political idea, seek and find it in itself?

It follows from the nature of the case that in times of political struggles and fluctuations, the Church, its self-consciousness increasing, would be disposed to aim at possessing an importance of its own, and would not be satisfied with being merely the handmaid of a ruler, a teacher and educator of the people paid by the state. A specifically hierarchical tendency developed in a particularly vigorous way in the leading West Frank church, and was promoted by noteworthy persons. This high church party was not, strictly speaking, Roman, but it clearly realized that its allies were in Rome, and that it must stretch out its hand to the pope. It was again a Gregory, this time Gregory the Fourth, who in the war between the brothers had done his utmost to free himself from his obligation to serve the emperor of the Franks and to stand forth as the protector and preserver of the unity of the Church.

From this party there issued one of the greatest and most momentous forgeries known to the history of

the world, that of the *Decretals of the Pseudo-Isidore*. It happened in the middle of the ninth century in the archiepiscopal diocese of Rheims, and was due most probably in a special sense to the circumstances that prevailed here in the days of the great archbishop Hinkmar. Its chief aim was to dissolve the partnership between the episcopacy and the state; and the primacy of the pope supplied the pretext for so doing. Here, in Rome, the bishops possessed a power which could protect them against kings and the great metropolitans who entered into engagements with kings, in the person of the pope, for it is he that rules the world and its ruler. By means of a number of forged papal letters this authority of Rome was traced back to the venerable and earliest days of the history of the Church. In an age in which the greatest scholars had learning enough to enable them to produce such a forgery, but in which people as yet had not the means of unmasking the deception in such an illuminative way that everyone could recognize it, this must have been regarded as a historical revelation. A legitimate foundation was thus established for the whole of the Middle Age, a programme was provided which only needed to be carried out!

This weapon was forged, not in Rome, but among the West Frank clergy; but in Rome was found the hand that had the skill to use it. As the great figure of Charles looms large in the history of the imperialism of the Middle Age, so does that of the great Pope Nicholas I. (858-867) in the history of the papacy, the Hildebrand before Gregory the Seventh. He proclaims the absolute right of the papacy in the Church: the pope's word is God's word, the pope's



act is God's act; he attains to the great idea that the apostolic chair in a spiritual sense is present everywhere. To be judged by no man, he has the right of judging all. All? However contrary to his wishes, he would have been obliged, in virtue of this right, to declare war on the system of territorial and state churches, and to let loose the secret conflict we have noted above. The king may not appoint bishops, may not call them together, may not judge a bishop. The law of the highest bishop, pope's law, takes precedence of king's law. Unworthy persons meddle with the sanctuary. Thus the idea of ruling over the Church leads to that of domination over the state.

Augustine was impressed by the events that were happening when he wrote his great book *De civitate Dei*; the ancient Roman empire was breaking up. In this case the divine state was not that imperial theocracy which Charles the Great dreamed of reviving and bringing to perfection; it was the hierarchical Church, the state being regarded as earthly and of the devil, full of light only in so far as the Church illumined it, but otherwise at best full of brilliant vices, and in any case bound to serve the Church. In the *Decretals of the Pseudo-Isidore*, however, which the pope received as a gift, proofs were provided by canon law of these general rules for the proper co-ordination of church and state. By the pope—after the time of Leo the Great, church and pope being identical—all crowns, even, are given. Impressed by the events that were taking place, the collapse of the Franco-Roman empire, Nicholas summarizes the old theories in

reply to those of the new Germanic-Romanic world. Imperatorem totius mundi se facit, "he is making himself emperor of the whole world," was the thought that occurred to friend and foe alike. The text for the next centuries was framed and expressed. Nicholas himself transforms Charles the Great's idea of a universal state church into that of a universal church state: the whole of Christendom is a church state, the pope is the emperor, princes as well as bishops are his vassals.

His career was too short for him to realize these great ideas—he died shortly before all these points were decided—and the general conditions of the time were too uncertain. The ideals of the pope, like those of the emperor, were dulled for a long time after the empire collapsed, and new forms everywhere struggled for existence. But he had provided the prelude to a struggle that was to come later. At present the Roman Catholic Church suffered severe losses, the Slavonic world being to a large extent torn from her, never to be united. What was effected by Greek policy and mission work among the Bulgarians, Servians, and South Russians, could not be balanced by all that Ansgar, in spite of the life-work to which he so faithfully devoted himself, did with enthusiastic ardour and love in the Scandinavian North. The political confusion spoiled everything.

The serious element was that when the empire broke up, and before new kingdoms had time to establish themselves on a national basis, the smaller powers struggled to obtain sovereign independence. For this there were deep-rooted causes. The most

diverse elements of population had settled on the soil of Gaul and Italy, and even the Germans did not enter history as a nation, but, from what we can gather, as old tribal allies. The tribes, especially the Bavarians, the Suabians, the Saxons, and the East Franks, aspired to royal independence. Union was reached in Germany earlier than among the West Franks—not to mention Italy: a form of national state erects itself *over* the heads of the tribal duchies. The strongest and most unconquered tribe, which was the latest to come upon the scene of history, the Saxon, set up a *German kingship* in the persons of Henry I. and Otto I. The process of fixing the boundaries of the kingdom involved its expansion to the north and east, to the Danish Normans and Slavs, and political expansion brought with it Christianization. The landmarks of Germany begin to extend to their present range.

The most difficult problem was to know how to check particularistic tendencies: it was not possible to destroy them and, following the example of the Carolingian empire, to resolve the kingdom into counties. Dukes became the highest terrace in the pyramid of the feudal system. Otto I. (936–973) had twice to fight for his throne against these powers. He therefore adopted that policy which had such an all-important bearing on the history of the German Church down to the time of Napoleon I.: he sought the help of his church against the great temporal lords, and the church provided him, as it did Clovis before him, with all that he needed, a power which transcended the limits of the tribe. Accordingly, he removed the division between the property of the

Church and the property of the crown, made the Church the administrator of as much crown property as possible, awarded it privileges, and converted the bishops and royal abbots into territorial lords, who paid him taxes and supplied the largest contingents for his army. In brief, he created a *German National Church*, whose life was intimately bound up, as it was bound to be, with that of the throne. The German national episcopate was the instrument used by the royal policy, not only against the lay powers, but often even against the pope, as it was still used by the Hohenstaufen. In its ranks were the most faithful friends and supporters of Henry IV. and Frederick Barbarossa.

Of course the arrangement was conditional, the condition being that the king should be allowed, in a real sense, to control the church, by having in particular a voice in the appointment of its officers; in short, that the territorial church should be his own. He was not content with following these principles himself; he even succeeded in impressing them upon the German policy that should guide the following generations. And yet this was the same king who, by rousing his opponents from their torpor, prepared the fate that was to befall these later generations.

Otto's plans extended beyond Germany in spite of the national bearing of his policy, along the path that leads to universalism. He invaded the kingdom of France, which was still in a state of great confusion, as well as the buffer state newly established in Burgundy, and finally Italy. He was summoned by the pope, who was only twenty-three years old,

to receive the imperial crown of Charles the Great. Yet at the same moment in which *he was reviving the imperium, he was setting the Roman sacerdotium on its feet*, rescuing it from the disgrace of being ruled by women, and bringing it back to its great ideals. Who would wish to reproach him with his shortness of vision, when leading spirits of our own age have not succeeded in developing a keener vision! All these facts can be explained only if we remember that, being the son of the strict believer, Matilda, he was full of high ideals, not merely of a political but also of an ecclesiastical nature. He really wished to help the disorganized Church to stand on its feet; the reform of the Church from top to bottom was started in the castles of the Saxon and Franconian emperors in the Hartz mountains. As Otto the First in Germany, while he raised the Church morally, religiously, and scientifically, simply used it as the instrument of his policy, so it was to be in the case of the whole Church, especially in the case of Rome.

Some of the theocratic ideals of Charles the Great reappear in these emperors, chiefly in Otto III. (983–1002) and Henry III. (1039–1056). Both of them, in fact, had a universal rule in view; great imperial plans were passing through their minds. Otto III. was an enthusiast who dreamed of a general imperial and papal rule of the world; Henry III., in whom the power of the holy Roman empire of *German* nationality reached its zenith, having even personally the greatest respect for the dignity of the Church, desired to reunite the papacy which had split into two at Sutri in the year 1046, and so make it

more effective, because he proposed to make use of it. Control over the pope was to insure control over his own church and to bring influence to bear upon the whole of Christendom, which, since the turn of the millennium, had included Hungary and the Scandinavian kingdoms. The pope must therefore be a subject of the emperor, as he was in the days of Charles the Great; must be appointed and if necessary removed by him, be made responsible to him. Accordingly, down to the middle of the eleventh century the imperium was master over the sacerdotium.

There were two mistakes here: we must not lose sight of the fact that in two ways the empire was different from that of Charles the Great. First, the imperial power was over-rated. The world was not governed directly; the imperium was merely a *German* kingdom with the addition of Italy, though at a later date of Burgundy as well, and as soon as the other states were released from their troubles, the kingdom of France from that caused by its vassals, England from that caused by the Danes, and became organized states, the pope was independent of this kingdom. The imperial church of Henry III. was at root a territorial church, not a universal church, and this alone constituted its strength. As soon as the emperors adopted universal plans, the German episcopate, which represented national ideals, began to murmur.

The second mistake consisted in the attitude adopted towards the antagonist: it was not so much a failure to estimate as a failure to understand his

strength. Even Henry III. failed to perceive that in reforming the Church, and especially the papacy, he was letting loose spirits which would soon be proof against any amount of exorcism. He had such faith in his cause, that he renounced the right of nominating the pope, and was satisfied with the privilege of ratifying the appointment. Indeed he did all he could for the reform-movement which was growing within the Church, in which he wished, as a sincerely devout Catholic, to find his allies, and in which consequently he did find them—in which, moreover, he ultimately found his enemy—and to pave a way for that movement to the highest place, the papal court.

As in the ninth century, a powerful tendency makes itself felt within the Church, when, influenced by the ideas of pseudo-Isidore, it had placed spiritual weapons in the hand of the pope, and helped him to help himself. At that date the movement had sprung up amongst the Gallican clergy. The cloister reform introduced by Benedict of Aniane, which was parallel with it, but of a purely religious and ascetic nature, had proceeded no further. Now the spirit of reform in the Burgundian cloister of Clugny and among the Lotharingian clergy became united, the one bringing to the union moral earnestness, the other canonistic facts and consciousness of hierarchical power. This spirit, in its united form, is the spirit which found embodiment in the person of Gregory VII. He was to a peculiar extent impelled by a strong religious conviction which exerted its full influence upon him; severe and uncompromising as he was, his soul was stirred by the thought of the greatness of his mission.

The sacerdotium, as understood by Rome, and the imperium, in the form which the Saxon and Franconian emperors had given it, enter upon their *gigantic struggle* only a few years after the death of Henry III. In view of all we have already said, it cannot be necessary to explain how it was that in this struggle, to which the scene at Canossa in 1077 supplies the climax, the principal question involved was that of *investiture*—the question whether emperor or pope should appoint the bishop, which in the end decides the further question whether the world should be dominated by a state-church or a church-state system. The alternative could only be decided upon if the bishops would agree to give up all their fees derived from secular sources, everything secular that was associated with their position. The idea first arose in the year 1111, but is hardly to be taken seriously, and in any case the German bishops revolted. But the *Concordat of Worms*, made in 1122, was influenced by this distinction; it proposed to discriminate between the powers. The king, as sovereign of the country, was to invest with the secular part of the episcopal office, the pope was to invest with the spiritual power. As a matter of fact the king secured the right of deciding, at least in Germany. What occurred was nothing more than a truce: meanwhile the papal court seized the opportunity of trying by wise exploitation of German weakness to attain peacefully what could not be accomplished by force.

The struggle, which is revived by the Hohenstaufen down to the time of Henry VI., presents no really new features: Frederick Barbarossa goes back to



the earlier position adopted at Worms, as it was still possible for him to do. Nevertheless, the new picture has more colour; our knowledge of events is fuller and better; both parties have more weapons at their disposal. While Rome sought support in that natural right which she declared to be identical with divine right, Barbarossa on the Roncalian Fields proclaimed the ancient right of the Roman emperors. After this began that struggle between canonical Roman and imperial Roman law which lasted hundreds of years, that battle between the new and old Roman spirit, which extended far into the period of the Reformation. Memorable figures on both sides! The emperor Barbarossa with his chancellor Rainald von Dassel on the one side, and on the other the pure and noble Alexander III., who is more readily pardoned for the humiliation of Frederick at Venice than Gregory VII. is for that of Henry at Canossa, though in his case the political losses were greater than in the other. But this was not the end.

A new element was first introduced in the year 1190. The *Crusades* had begun to bring the Orient within the range of Western interests. The first result of this was that the Church made a great effort to wrest from the power of the unbeliever the lands which had been taken by Islam—for “God willed it”; it meant, in the second place, that a whole world of civilization was made accessible to people who had previously been cut off from it. Emperor and papal power disputed as to which should guide the ideal forces of the age. In connection with this arose the idea of a *rule of the Mediterranean*, and the notion

of imperialism as well as of the papacy grows to a wider extent. The papacy saw a chance of recapturing the schismatic church of the Greek East, of making the holy patriarchates of old rise again, of pressing anew the claims which had to be dropped for centuries after the times of Leo and Gregory the Great; in like manner, imperialism had a task in view which was great enough to make people turn dizzy at the thought of it; for one moment a sphere of influence equal to that of the oldest Imperium Romanum was nearly reached.

When Henry entered upon the *inheritance of Sicily*, he seemed at one stroke to be in command of a central position from which to carry out these universal plans and at the same time to ward off for all time all elements of danger produced by the political pretensions and spiritual encroachments of the pope. German policy as regards Rome had always suffered from a disadvantage: Rome lay on the boundary lines of the imperial sphere of influence. Henceforth in such circumstances this impediment could and ought to be removed.

Such is the situation which presented itself down to the time of the interregnum. We are entering upon the last phase of the struggle. It was a battle in which no quarter was to be given. On the south the kingdoms of Henry VI. and Frederick II. held the papal power as in a vice; it was lost and doomed to impotence unless it could succeed in snapping the connection between South Italy and Germany. Innocent III. seemed to be succeeding in doing this. The world seemed really to be growing into a mighty church state, in which the pope ruled, as the true

heir of the Roman Cæsars and the Frank Charles the Great, in secular and spiritual affairs alike. The Lateran Council of the year 1215 may be considered to mark the zenith of power reached by the papacy at any time. But there was first to come that wrestle between the stubborn popes Gregory IX. and Innocent IV. and the powerful Frederick II., which presented one of the greatest scenes in the history of the world, and fixed itself securely in the memory of men. The aims were so great and the stakes so high; the principles were so logically stated—on the one hand a purely state church, on the other a most unscrupulous use of spiritual means for worldly ends—and the characters of the opponents were such, that the struggle possessed features which were gigantic and even dæmonic.

The popes were triumphant in the sense that they beat down the great Staufer and the Staufer brood. But while the opponents were fighting, they were blind to what was taking place in the rest of the world. Meanwhile all the external circumstances had changed. In order to destroy the German imperium, the sacerdotium had to all intents and purposes sold its freedom to France. Both imperialism and papacy were morally and politically ruined by the struggle, the conquered party dragging the conqueror after it into the grave.

## XII

### SPIRITUAL LIFE IN THE CHURCH OF THE MIDDLE AGE

SACERDOTIUM and imperium, and the conflict between the two—this was the great drama in the external history of the Middle Age. The lines of this great historical readjustment unravel themselves from the time of Charles the Great, who created a theocratic imperialism, a form of universal state church, to that of Innocent III., who brought the idea of a papal domination of the world, a form of universal church state, to perfection, and his successors.

At the conclusion of it we have the victory of Rome, the misery of the interregnum, and the end of the last of the Hohenstaufen on the scaffold at Naples. While as regards the Eastern Greek-Catholic Church, imperio-papalism describes the relations between the spiritual and secular power, in the West the state of things which prevailed was quite the reverse. The pope is lord even in secular affairs, the higher emperor whose tiara is adorned with a double royal diadem; bishop's law and pope's law take precedence of king's law and emperor's law; the court of the monarch is simply the court of the pope. His special ambassadors, the legates, as the

well-known saying puts it, flew through the world like the angels of God and made him present everywhere; they were spiritual substitutes for the *missi dominici*, the king's messengers employed by Charles the Great. The whole hierarchy, a body of officials in which different grades were nicely distinguished, was at his disposal; its most eminent representatives were made answerable to the pope in a direct and peculiar way by means of an oath of fidelity modelled on the oath taken by secular vassals. In former time the Princeps sent forth rescripts from Rome to his governors in the provinces, and the will of the highest authority was made to prevail in a most minute and extreme fashion; now the same control was again exercised by means of the decrees, bulls, and briefs of the popes. The Roman Catholic Church was a form of state, a great *legal system*! The spirit of Roman law, like the spirit of Roman politics, with which it was related, has here sought refuge, and in the form of canon law produced a new development.

The character of the Church as an institution, an organization having statutes, a legal code, a class of officials and forms of censure, which began to develop in the second century, was not fully developed until the Middle Age. During the last twenty years it has been proved that the *substance* of the apostolic message was *Hellenized* on the soil of the Græco-Roman empire; similarly, it can now be shown that *Roman* genius decided the form in which the message was to be stereotyped and adjusted. It has been shown that at a very early date the influence of Greek philosophy was brought to bear upon the

Church ; research ought now to show further how it was affected by contact with Roman jurisprudence.

But if the characteristic feature of the Catholicism of the *Middle Age* is that Christianity assumed the form of a juristic scheme, and the Church that of a legal system, the natural explanation is that Christianity did not grow out of the form of civilization known to the Germanic peoples who made the history of the Middle Age, but, coming to them from without as something new and immeasurably superior, was imposed upon the people, for the most part with their consent, by the state, and as part of its system. When a king was converted, many thousands of his people followed his example and adopted the same kind of life in private and public. By means of the law of the Church and the discipline of the crozier the rude Europæan peoples were gradually educated. The only trouble was that in proportion as the peoples developed, this method of education was intensified more and more, until the chain snapped.

Kahl, professor of canon law at Berlin, some years ago delivered an excellent festival-oration on the binding nature of the creed and on freedom in teaching. He rightly contended that the position of the Catholic Church is different from that of the evangelical, every statement of belief in the Catholic Church being also a legal command. The contention can be changed into its contrary: in the Catholic Church a dogmatic importance attaches to every statement of church law, because it expresses the infallible authority of the Church. The bishops were guarantees of the correctness of that truth which

was made a pattern for all men and all times; as regards the past they insured the choice of the right facts; as regards the future they guaranteed that the facts were understood and interpreted in the right way. The belief that the sacred truth was confided to the officers of the Church, that it was, as it were, bound up with the constitution, is a precondition of all further development, and is therefore supposed to guide men to the truth; belief in the constitution includes belief in all the Catholic dogmas as well as in its system of discipline. The constitution provided the channels of tradition; the tradition, however, of which Irenæus already spoke with the enthusiasm of a new faith is not, as has often been affirmed, represented as a second source of knowledge, the first being Scripture, or the documents which deal with the origin of our religion, but as being *above* and *superior to* Scripture, because it shows correctly how the first foundations of the Church are to be understood. The fundamental requirement is a blind faith in the Church, a belief "wrapped up" in these beliefs of the Church, and only to that extent a personal belief; a *fides implicita* is the faith that is necessary and sufficient. Belief is the inward act of obedience to the Church; piety is conformity to church law.

In the Middle Age people were confronted on all sides by the commands of the Church; they were encompassed, as it were, with a ring of iron; all their thoughts, desires and feelings, knowledge, worship and piety, were regulated for them. In all three respects the Catholic Christian had simply to take over that part of the inheritance from the ancient

Church which he was told to regard as truly Christian devotion and truly Christian morality. The ancient Church presented to the new and infant peoples its dogma, cultus, and monasticism, that they might improve themselves with their help. We must show briefly how they succeeded.

To the Apostolicon and its amplification, the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan creed, which was regarded as the fruit of the struggle with Arius, was added during the time of transition to the Middle Age what is known as the third œcumenical symbol; it originated in Gaul, and incorrectly bears the title of "the Athanasian Creed." The Creed gathers up in particularly precise terms the results of the great struggles over the trinitarian and christological dogmas in the ancient Church, shows in the trinitarian section the influence of the teaching of Augustine, which had so much in common with that of Athanasius, and in the christological section converts the holy paradoxes of the creed of Chalcedon, which cannot even have been suggested by the spirit of Athanasius, into a rule of faith. "Quicumque," the symbol was called from its introductory words, quicumque vult salvus esse, "whosoever will be saved," before all things it is necessary that he hold the "Catholic Faith," "which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly." The number of those ideas concerning these the greatest of all questions which were confirmed by the Church, was strictly defined; the ratio or reason was only permitted to elaborate these. This is what was meant by *scholasticism*.



The whole of the theology of the Middle Age is scholastic. It does not represent a free handling of the Christian facts of salvation and of the ideas suggested by them and the development of a Christian conception of the world, in the way that Origen had still treated them. What it represents is an aptitude for logic such as could be taught and learned in a school, a skill in explaining and supporting the doctrines which the Church had already decided to deduce from those acts and ideas. The method had been started even in the ancient Church—we have touched upon it already—by Leontius of Byzantium (about 530), in the time of Justinian, by Maximus Confessor († 662) in the time of the monothelite controversy, and by John Damascene († *circa* 750) at the time of the dispute about images. The two latter had been brought into the West during the Carolingian period with their decadent epigonic art; here the disciples in due course became masters. Scotus Erigena (about 850) was but a solitary star at the court of Charles the Bald. On account of his Greek pantheism he occupies a position midway between Origen and Spinoza; he does not belong to the age of Pope Nicholas I., being himself the greatest, almost too ripe, product of the Carolingian Renaissance.

The real period of scholasticism began in the eleventh century, when the “dark age” was past; Anselm of Canterbury has usually and rightly been regarded as its father. This Italian, a friend of the pope and of the curial system, who had been elevated to the highest position in the English Church, who was the leading spirit in the English controversy

concerning investiture, regarded a statement of belief as a positive statement of law: "I must first believe, in order to be able to understand." But a statement of belief, like the law, can be shown to be reasonable: "I believe, with a view to understanding." Indeed Anselm possessed the naïve conviction that the whole belief of Christians could be proved to unbelievers to be reasonable and necessary, and he undertook to do this in the case of the chief doctrines, those of God and of redemption. The fact that God *is* follows from our being able to think of Him as the most perfect Being; and since He is, He *must*, in accordance with His being, act as He did in Christ—*quod erat demonstrandum*. The philosophical basis on which the whole argument rests can be clearly perceived: it is the idealism with which Plato has made us familiar and which involves the rationalistic presupposition that our thinking of itself implies being; our ideas are the reality, the facts or "res." This Platonising idealism of the Middle Age is therefore described as "realism." Through it the old dogma, greatly improved upon with the help of Plato, was re-created, and justified in such a way as to satisfy the reason. As late as the end of the real Middle Age Raimundus Lullus went to Africa, firmly persuaded that he would be able as a matter of course to convince the Moors of the truth of the Christian religion. They gave him no time to display his "great art," but struck him dead (*circa* 1315). He was a fanatic, both spiritually and intellectually.

Meanwhile this naïve kind of faith was everywhere seriously shaken. *Dialectic* was a dangerous weapon.

It could be used against dogma, as well as in support of it. Abelard († 1142) himself made a start in this direction; he found that the Fathers themselves said both "Yes" and "No" at the same time. Moreover, the other great master in the ancient world, Aristotle, who had hitherto merely taught logical thinking, by degrees became better known and exerted a more and more definite and positive influence. Philosophical criticism was introduced, and destroyed or disturbed the belief in the deductive methods of Plato. A new realism displaced the old form. Ideas exist *only in* things, and not as independent entities above or, one may say, before them. But if there is no reason why our ideas should lead us to infer being, how are we *to prove* the reality, the necessary reality, of the highest supersensible things, the statements about God's essential nature and incarnation, and therefore the old dogma?

People began to place the objects of belief in two different classes. The lower one included the statements which could be made entirely by the use of the reason, a natural, pagan-Aristotelian theology. The upper one was reserved for revealed truth, which is ultimately a divine secret; this truth can at most be shown to be credible, that is to say, not contrary to reason. Thus philosophy and faith were given their due, and were both brought into connection again, the service of dialectic being invoked, in so far as its skill availed, for the purpose of supporting the sovereign dogma, or, if we may use a metaphor, of supplying additional horses and a retinue. The second stage of scholasticism, and its zenith, were reached when Thomas Aquinas gathered up the whole

result of the movement in his *Summa Theologiae*, which is still the principal text-book of Catholic dogmatics. He lived in the period in which the Hohenstaufen succumbed to the pope, and his work really represents in the field of learning a companion picture to that presented by the practical methods which the great but severe popes had adopted at the time. Even now the systems represented by Thomas Aquinas and Innocent have to be viewed together.

So far doubt had only been the means of enthroning the doctrine of the Church more securely; but at the end of the Middle Age the reasoning process was completed in both directions. Doubt becomes more and more active. One of Anselm's contemporaries, Roscellinus, had already come to the conclusion that general notions, ideas, really followed things, are only the means by which individual things are subjectively comprehended and represented, are merely "names," not "things." In due course all statements concerning the supersensual world had to run the gauntlet of criticism; dogma and rational idealism were at an end, and scepticism was able to rule supreme. But although this "nominalism" came more and more into evidence after the time of Duns Scotus († 1308), the majority of the people were unshaken in their conviction that dogma had a right and proper place in the domain of thought. If the Church affirmed a thing, it must be correct, and no rational proof was necessary. The statement might even be contrary to reason; if so, this very fact would be a guarantee of its truth. This was the opinion of William of Occam († 1347). "I believe

because it is absurd." This might have meant that the soul was free and not a slave to the reason ; that the rationalism or intellectualism which had been handed on from ancient times had lost its charm ; that the subjective religious conviction which no amount of knowledge could supply was assigned an independent value. But the result was a despotism of the Church which might be quite as arbitrary as the God of nominalism. In proportion as the subjective ground becomes more uncertain, do an unrestrained belief in and strict obedience to the Church become requisite. What more could happen ? People seemed to be insured against the future, whatever it might have in store.

Thus the number of the fundamental dogmas which had been handed down from ancient times and fixed and decided by the œcumenical councils was retained, but not increased. "Christianity" consisted in the statements made about the Trinity and Incarnation. Only in one case, in a matter very closely connected with the Christology of two natures, the doctrine of the Eucharist, was something added ; and here again it was the Lateran Council of the year 1215, when the papal power had reached its zenith, that made the idea of transformation, the doctrine of transubstantiation, a dogma.

But œcumenical councils had not as yet decided all the questions as to how the work of Christ was to be understood and the fruit of it appropriated. The teaching of the great Augustine had led to a number of new ideas being transmitted to the West ; his doctrine of grace, his explanation of the Eucharist, and his mysticism, provided a new stimulus and called

forth new efforts. One scholar, Anselm, developing his work, had proclaimed that Christianity meant redemption, had explained this as a release from guilt, and thus had come into closer touch with the moral essence of the gospel than any earlier scholar had done. The mystic Bernard of Clairvaux, with a new contemplative zeal, had dwelt upon the picture of the crucified Christ; and on all hands people were ready for a doctrine of sacraments. A number of ideas—ideas of a fruitful and far-reaching kind—had come to life. But there were no general decisions. Occasional papal decrees, particular church authorities of ancient and more recent date, could be appealed to, no doubt; but it was actual *practice* and custom, that is to say, what was done and permitted by the higher powers in the Church, what, in particular, was done and made authoritative by the pope, that decided the matter. This means that what had weight was the prestige of the Church; in other words, the prestige of the pope. Even Thomas Aquinas actually proclaimed the infallibility of the pope; this was the source from which human thought had to decide what was eternal truth and what falsehood. The papal constitution now provided the framework for dogma; belief in the authority of the pope, in the divine nature of this new form of Roman law, held the different portions together.

Ultimately thought must be destroyed by a sort of narcosis of feeling: *worship* of the divine forces which are at work in the Church and in its means of grace was the fundamental note.

We must necessarily suppose that the Teuton was not so sensitive and impressionable as the Oriental,

æsthetically not so fastidious as, above all others, the Greek. He was ruder, more a child of nature, and had less control over his impulses. True, the Teuton had previously no mystery cult to introduce him to another world and to enable him really to enjoy communion with God, but in his naïve way perceived the rule of a Deity and of forces of light and darkness in nature and in the present life. For this reason, beyond all doubt, witchcraft played a great part in the religion of the old Germanic people; for this reason the Teuton was none the less ready to acquiesce in a physical explanation of spiritual and moral relations, to believe in astounding miracles, to interpret the means of grace in a material sense, and to believe that they possessed a magic power. True, his paganism knew no priestly caste, who mediated in a mysterious way between God and the world like a higher class of beings, no such elaborate houses in which the Deity dwelt, but this was all the more reason why the cultus of the Romans, as well as their whole civilization, should make an overpowering impression upon his simpler mind. It was certainly a matter of great significance that being at the stage at which the Teutons were in law and religion, both of which are closely connected, formalism reigned supreme in word and deed—that is to say, in ritual, formulas, and symbols. This state of mind prepared them to accept reverently *the whole of the Christian system of cultus as something ordained by divine law*. At the same time the tendency which we have already noticed on the soil of the old empire, to lay special stress on the liturgical and ritual at the expense of

the doctrinal and pastoral, must have increased in the various acts of cultus.

In one quarter, then, we find the Catholic cultus in still greater danger of degenerating into a mechanical system of magic. Its character being so material, performance in itself, the *opus operatum*, is enough; the frame of mind is a matter of minor importance; the gifts of grace can be ordered and dispensed universally, without requiring any preparation or fitness to receive them on the part of the individual who is benefited.

This was true of both *Baptism* and the *Eucharist*. In the ancient Church it was not the general custom to baptize children; preparation for baptism and the baptismal ceremony were designed for grown persons. Now, however, that the new peoples had become Christians in their entirety, and children were born into a society whose members were united in the faith, receiving the name of Christian as a matter of course, as something which was part and parcel of their environment, some change was bound to be introduced. With the sacrament of baptism God now welcomed the newborn child into His Church; in baptism the pastoral and catechetical purpose found no place; the work that remained was ritual and liturgical, which, too, originally and in like manner concerned grown-up pagans. Since all the ceremonies, exorcisings of devils and crossings, "examinations" and confessions, were retained, and the god-parents had to answer for the child only in the passages in which the candidate for baptism is supposed to speak, a purely mechanical performance of certain acts, and utterance of certain words which



had some magic and mysterious effect, were the result.

There was more than one controversy regarding the Eucharist in the Middle Age. The question how the bread and wine must be supposed to be related to the body and blood of Christ pressed for a direct decision. When once, with the help of Alcuin, the Melanchthon of Charles the Great, the Christological teaching of Cyril of Alexandria, his doctrine of deification, had proved victorious, notwithstanding the fact that the formulas of Chalcedon incorporated in the Athanasian Creed were of a different character, there could be no doubt that the answers to the questions suggested by the Eucharist would be framed in the same tenor; apart from other considerations, since the multitude put such faith in miracles, the questions had necessarily been long ago decided in a practical way even in the ancient Church. Paschasius Radbertus succeeded in gaining more influence than Ratramnus, and the more liberal view of Berengarius of Tours was decreed for all time to be heretical by the dogma of the year 1215, which we have mentioned above, and which, strictly speaking, was the only dogma made in the Middle Age. The human nature in Christ is supposed to have been entirely absorbed by the divine nature, so that He was no longer a real man, but merely retained the semblance of one; in like manner, the word of the priest during the celebration of Mass magically changes the bread into the body of the Lord, so that it is no longer real bread, but only preserves its taste and colour.

Along this line there was a development which was not really very different from the Byzantine. In

spite of the heroic efforts of individual men in the brighter period of the Carolingian Renaissance, men like Claudius of Turin, in spite of the note of enlightenment which is struck in the "Libri Carolini," in direct opposition to Byzantium, the Germanic - Romanic world also became steeped in the *worship of saints, images, and relics*; and just as in former times people were captivated by stories of elves and giants, so now their imagination revelled in miracles which were supposed to have taken place at the resting-places of the life-giving bones of the martyrs. It was only natural that, in particular, the worship of relics should have become extraordinarily popular in this age which looked with such enthusiasm and veneration on what was left them by an earlier period. People took over from the Christian past, in addition to art, literature, and general culture, the whole galaxy of persons and things which were deemed worthy of worship; and the country *ultra montes* became the classical home, not of the manuscripts only, but even of the holy bones. God Himself had disappeared behind a cloud of intermediaries and witnesses. In His place the Church enthusiastically cherished this apparatus for bestowing divine life which was continually receiving additions; and, as the famous letter sent by Gregory the Great to the ambassadors of the faith in England exemplifies, by reinterpreting the Germanic paganism in a Christian way, it made it useful and subservient.

But we can detect another line of development converging with and supplementing the line we have been tracing. The *moral* spirit of the West did not show any sign of growing weaker on Germanic

soil; the result was that in dogma new questions arose (Anselm), and cultus was not allowed to persist in magic. A start, at least, was taken in the direction of making some instruction in Christianity follow baptism, and the separation of the bath of water taken at the baptismal ceremony from the laying on of hands became the means of obtaining a solemn final ceremony in the sacrament of *confirmation*, the age for which in the year 1274 was advanced to the seventh year. It was in the Roman Middle Age, since the time of Gregory the Great, that the idea of a sacrifice in the Mass became generally prevalent, and at the same time, while the physical participation in the sacrament falls into the background, the moral benefit of forgiveness of sins, if only as the result of human action, is more strongly emphasized. Finally, to compensate for the fact that there is no longer any means of personally appropriating the gift of grace, the *institution of penance* is changed, elevated to the rank of a sacrament, and made a new and powerful means of grace; through it the individual is continually promised that God will directly forgive his particular sins.

All this implies, at the same time, a logical development of the idea of a hierarchy, an increase in the power of the priest and the Church. Confirmation was made an independent ceremony, because it was thought that the bishop, since he was the channel of the Holy Spirit, should be left to complete the act of introduction into the Church. But the congregation, which indeed was no longer allowed to taste of the cup, became more and more superfluous, in proportion as the sacrificial act of the priest became

prominent in the Eucharist; and now, through the creation of the new sacrament of penance, the priest was made in every respect the judge who stood in the place of God, shut or opened the gates of heaven, and by meting out punishment was able to reduce or prolong the journey through purgatory. But in a superlative sense admission and exclusion, censure and indulgence, were in the power of the chief of all priests at Rome. He could deprive whole countries of the grace of God, or promise it to all, without distinction and in full measure, if they submitted to the tasks appointed them.

From the number of ceremonies which people regarded as "sacraments," the Church, following the example of Peter Lombard († 1160), finally selected seven. How uncertain the standard was is clear from the fact that marriage—we do not mean the wedding-ceremony—was included amongst them. We cannot doubt that among these seven the really all-important sacrament, in fact though not in theory, was that of *Ordination*, this being the sacramental form taken by the fundamental Catholic idea that the holder of the office becomes possessed of a special *charisma*, because by the laying on of hands it has been handed on from one generation of bishops to another since the times of the apostles.

The Germanic world of the Middle Age derived even its *ideal of life* from the ancient world: the truly proper and perfect life was *that of asceticism, monasticism*. It must have appeared a stranger form of life to the Germans than it had seemed to people in the West in the time of Jerome, when it

came into vogue. Picture the pagan Teutons with their activity, their love of fighting, and their pride in their strength! In storm and victory they felt the presence of the supreme God. Contrast that practice of introspection which might be thought better to befit women, that negative ethic of renunciation sprung from the soil of the indolent Orient! When St Severinus met the Marcomanni on the banks of the Danube he seemed to them like a spirit from another world.

But just as in scholasticism the mind of the Germans exercised and moulded itself on Greek speculation, so their passionate nature was disciplined by asceticism, and the spiritual powers of their souls were awakened by that mysticism in which it culminated. The overflow of the feelings which had found vent in barbaric brutality or unbridled worldliness was suddenly changed—in how many “saints”!—into an earnest and thrilling penitence, so that when the conscience was smitten by the words of the divine or ecclesiastical guide, the same passion was aroused in an entirely opposite direction. These strong natures were able in a moment to reverse the current of their inner and outer life, to make it so entirely different as to be characterized by the practice of the strictest devotion.

And what happened so often in the case of an individual, may be observed on a large scale as well. The days of a general lack of discipline are over, and are followed by periods devoted to serious reforms which originated in the cloisters and took monastic forms. When, as about the year 900, worldliness and disorder reached their height, a new germ of life

became active in the quiet of the cloister. The same storm which raged in the outside world impelled people here and there to bury themselves deeper in the seclusion of the cloister-cell, that they might seek in its recesses the hidden face of God. New forms, new communities, devoted to the ascetic life, arose, and a moral earnestness came back from this quarter into the Church and its secular clergy. The reforms introduced by Benedict of Aniane about the year 800, at Clugny about 900, at Citeaux about 1100, by the orders of mendicant friars about 1200, redounded to the advantage of the whole Church. The mission to the German tribes went forth from the cloisters of England and Ireland; the same cloisters handed on that system of church discipline which prevailed in the Middle Age and has been preserved to the present time: not only indulgence but the practice of secret confession as well, the confessional chair in which the "father confessor" tries the hearts and reins, the systematic process by which the soul is guided even in its deepest imaginings. It was monasticism that produced that transformation of the system of penance practised in the ancient Church which enabled it now and for the first time properly to take in hand the training of the young lay members.

All this reminds us again that Western asceticism was from the start different in character from that of the East. We find, it is true, a close imitation of the saints of the Egyptian deserts. The hermit in his forest cell has become a standing type in our art and folk-poetry. Even in the Middle Age there were famous saints in Italy and France who felt tears to be the greatest bliss, and dirt a comfort. We need

only mention St Nilus of Rossano († 1005). On the whole, however, these monks of the Middle Age were a far more active and creative class. We do not refer to such men as the valiant monks of St Gall, with which Scheffel's *Elkehard* has made us all familiar, though they at once occur to us; if need be, they would draw a cuirass over their cowls. We are thinking particularly of the immense learned, artistic, and social *achievements* in the German cloisters, among the different varieties of Benedictines, especially in the settlements of the Cistercians. Our German civilization from the Lake of Constance to Danzig we owe in large measure to these monks. We are also thinking of the fact that the cloisters once more entered into close communion with one another; congregations spread over whole countries, and "Orders" sprang up and developed a constitution which, side by side with that of the hierarchy, first gave monasticism its full power in the world. It was not accidental that the Orders were in due course uniformly secularized—the earnest desire to forsake the world never persisted for any great length of time.

This also explains the fact that the opposition to the secular Church which became part of the nature of monasticism in the hour of its birth now gave place to a firm *alliance* between the two. When Constantine by making the Church part of the organism of the state, completed its character as the secular Church, the old ideal of a holy community living apart from the world sought refuge, as we have seen, in monasticism. But a remarkable change took place in the Middle Age: the secular Church was monasticized; the greatest popes were monks;

the highest demand made by asceticism, that of celibacy, which cuts men off from the life of the family and the people, was made of all priests and was actually attained. The monks themselves were called *patres* instead of *fratres*, received the consecration of priests, preached, administered the sacraments; in fact, became in some measure the real confessors of the people. As soon as new Orders had been founded, or while they were being founded, they cultivated the friendship of the pope, and in a special way placed themselves at the service of the highest representative of the Church. Finally, that greatest and most lovable saint of the Middle Age, St Francis of Assisi († 1226), took denial of the world so seriously that he wished to adopt the apostolic ideal of poverty, or what was supposed to be the apostolic ideal, to the extent of becoming a beggar. And yet the mendicant orders of Franciscans and Dominicans formed an alliance with the pope, became his armies, and the Dominicans, in particular, acted as his executioners. This, again, happened in the days of Innocent III. In the West monasticism in its different forms ultimately became through its service an integral part of the One Catholic Church that ruled the world.

This more active and public mode of asceticism introduced another form: monasticism attracted the lay world, as well as the priests of the Church, to its own ideal, though in an entirely different way. Francis lived in a real sense *in* the world, and appreciated its natural beauty as much as he deplored the misery of men, but at the same time he lived *above* the world. The Cistercians sought, at least, places of solitude, and then transformed them into places of



civilization; the orders of mendicants went at once to the centres of busy life, to Milan and Lyons, to preach in their streets and squares a life of voluntary poverty and penitence. From the twelfth century onwards a number of half-monastic modes of life began to be cultivated: knightly orders, Hospitallers, Tertiaries, Penitentials, Beguines, brotherhoods, and such like. The whole life of a town was intermingled with this system of half-ascetic clubs. But all this, again, swelled the triumph of the Church. Since the pope at Rome kept the register, a note was struck which reverberated, not only throughout the whole hierarchy, but throughout the Orders as well, including even the individual brotherhoods in which in his own way the honest citizen was able to do something for the salvation of his soul. Amongst the humbler class of laity, however, the confessional chair was the means of inculcating dutiful obedience and a correct attitude of mind. That same Lateran Council held during the rule of Innocent III. in the year 1215 which adopted the doctrine of transubstantiation, made confession obligatory at least once a year.

This mighty organism suffered to an increasing extent from derangements. The church executive was inadequate. Now, however, the state filled the gap and was made to serve the Church. "The Church does not drink blood"; nevertheless without the shedding of blood the Albigenses could not be conquered. Accordingly, another feature was adopted from the programme of Augustine and Leo: *coge intrare*, "compel them to come in." In these words the Lord through his Church invoked the help of the state, and the state lent its harsh aid in order to

inflict civil punishment on persons who were guilty of an offence against the faith of the Church. Thus that friendly alliance formed between the Inquisition, the Crusade against heretics, and the state executive, succeeded in crushing the heretical movement in the South of France, which was already in a large district threatening the very existence of the Church. It was the great Innocent again who was destined to win the battle.

Never, perhaps, has one man possessed such power as Innocent III. wielded in the year 1215. It was he who decided upon the wearer of the crown of Germany; from him the English king received his island kingdom as a fief; the kings of Aragon and Bulgaria were his vassals; and even the powerful French ruler Philip II. Augustus was obliged to cancel his divorce when the pope commanded it. In the East, during the fourth crusade, Byzantium became part of the Latin world, and so was incorporated into the Roman form of church. The ambassadors of the princes of Cyprus and Jerusalem were present at the Lateran Council, and took part in the spiritual review. This comprised seventy-one archbishops and patriarchs, those of Constantinople and Jerusalem being present in person, those of Antioch and Alexandria by proxy, and altogether 412 bishops, 800 abbots and priors.

We must allow the magnificence of this picture presented by the papacy at the zenith of its power to exercise upon us its full effect. Such is the ideal which still, consciously or unconsciously, looms in front of the Roman "Irreconcilables" and of our own ultramontane party as well.

## XIII

### THE DISRUPTION OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND DAWN OF A NEW AGE

WE have already given a general view of Roman Catholicism and its development down to the time of Innocent III. ; but, in doing so, we have kept out of sight all such features as were calculated to blur the picture and impair its effect. It is obvious that all the dissolvent forces which became active in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were in existence long before ; they formed an undercurrent which to those who had eyes to see must have seemed to be growing continually stronger. But we were justified in sketching events in the way we have done, because it was possible, even down to the thirteenth century, to hold the new ideas and forces in check ; the old forces were still able to prevail and to unite their strength in the form of the papacy. Of course the more thoroughly they were all united in the papacy, and the more logically the principle of a universal theocracy of the pope which prevailed in the Middle Age was carried out, the more disastrous must have been the effect of the collapse of this the highest authority, the more fatal the

catastrophe at this, the centre of unity and crystallization. When the papacy broke up, it buried the world of the Middle Age in its ruins, with the result that the new forces became free and able to take effect.

Thus we are already breathing the air of a new age. When it fully dawned, the curtain had fallen on the great drama which closed with the collapse of the form of the One Catholic Church which was supposed to have been established for all eternity. This age, which was marked by severe convulsions, did not terminate until the middle of the seventeenth century. In the end, churches with various confessions superseded the One Church throughout Europe. Christians ceased to worship God in a single way; the idea of an exclusive universalism had been overcome, and had given place to that of toleration and equal privilege.

This new order of the Church sprang from the innermost sanctuary, and from the experiences of a great human heart. But before God appealed to this heart and awakened those feelings which afterwards reverberated throughout the world and produced so unexpected a triumph, the soil had to be broken up, the old state of things in its form and substance must be made to totter; before the essential point at which the new order must start could be found, pressure must be brought to bear upon the centre from the circumference, in order that, nourished from the centre, the whole of life might be filled with a new being. Since the secular and spiritual systems were combined, since in the Middle Age state and church were closely connected, the new order of

church could not arise until violent struggles had taken place in the political world. Here, again, to a large extent political and ecclesiastical history are still bound up together. The path to religious peace led through the battlefields of religious wars.

Accordingly, we have arrived at an epoch in which great efforts for reform shook the vast old building, and at various times and in sundry places even brought it to the ground, an epoch in which was started the pioneer work for the great age of Reformation. And this age was again followed by a period in which the ancient Church pulled itself together and gathered up the political forces at its disposal, and in which both the old and new forms of church, after bloody and critical conflicts, succeeded in firmly adjusting themselves: Reform, Reformation, Counter-reformation, are the watchwords of a period of church history which makes an increasingly powerful and direct impression upon us. We must first deal with the prelude, the efforts made towards reform.

When we last dealt with the *constitution* of the Church we found that its importance consisted in its being the antecedent and framework of all Catholic thought and action, the hierarchical and judicial organization which, in its final development as the Curial system, issued decrees even as regards science, worship, and piety. If the essence of Christianity, the gospel, was again to be allowed free scope, if it was to readjust its relations to the world and to acquire or generate new life, this all-powerful form of Christianity must be shattered, or at any rate deprived of its strength.

This was the first achievement of the age of

transition. There were ceaseless conflicts over the constitution; the battle-cry "reformatio in capite et membris" had special reference to the matter of church constitution and the system of administration connected with it. Two things combined to produce this warfare: (1) the system of an absolute Roman monarchy had fallen a prey to corruption, and Rome had neither the power nor the will to reform itself; (2) the system had to meet a fresh opponent in the shape of a new national and territorial state, which even in its form as generally established at the time—the royal power being limited by the Assembly of the Estates—was obliged to disown the principle of Roman Catholicism with its medieval corollaries in a still more decisive way than the Germanic feudal state of the real Middle Age had done before. Royal supremacy could not be conceived of apart from ecclesiastical supremacy.

The German monarchy and imperialism had been shattered by the victory of the sacerdotium. From the time of the Interregnum the German crown became a mere shadow, and finally, in the year 1806, it vanished into thin air. The reawakening of German hopes after the year 1806 is very properly associated with the name of Frederick Barbarossa, not with that of Frederick II. Even in the former's reign Germany, like Italy, was split up into a number of separate territories. Of the seven electors who were at the head of it the three who were clerics were regarded as vicars and vassals of the pope. Compared with the power formerly represented by the German crown, the power of these German and Italian princes and cities seemed harmless. But the victory had

been dearly purchased. Innocent the Fourth, for instance, a man full of the warmest devotion to the Church, and a Fiesco of the Genoese house of the Counts of Lavagna, thought he was entitled to use any means that helped him to attain his ends. There was no law, no ordinance, that he would not have broken in order to further these higher purposes. While outwardly the papacy was congratulating itself on having gained its proudest triumph, it was forsaking its best ideals, becoming entirely secularized, and entering upon that maladministration which was soon to become the really mortal disease of the whole system. Many examples of this might be given, but one will suffice. In the fifth year of his rule, Innocent had already promised thirty-eight clerics, some of whom were certainly and perhaps all of whom were Italians, the prospect or reversion of the twenty prebends in the church of Constance—but not the positions themselves. This method brought money, and created devoted agents, but in a moral sense it ruined the Church.

It had not been found possible to overcome worldly opponents simply with the help of spiritual troops; papal diplomacy had succeeded in setting one potentate against another. In the political game of chess the papal players came to attach an increasing importance to the figure of the king of France. The Curia, in order to overthrow the emperor, had looked with as friendly an eye as possible upon the power of the German princes and Italian cities; it was now equally friendly towards the king of France. It attracted the French to Sicily and Naples in order to be rid of the Hohenstaufen. By degrees, in the

second half of the thirteenth century French influence from the South, and in Italy still, hemmed in the pope. Rome had fostered her own conqueror though she did not know it.

The stirring feature in the story of the conflict between Boniface the Eighth and Philip the Fair of France is the contrast presented by the pretensions of the pope and the real fact which was suddenly made clear even to the dim-sighted: the astonishment felt by the pope when he realized his own position was literally fatal. His behaviour to Philip was indeed brusque and even rude; his Bulls, and finally his world-famous *Unam sanctam*, presented his claims in a form that was particularly wounding, and, in the ears of a monarch, offensive. Yet as regards their matter, and from the point of view of dogma, these claims were not really different from those put forward and successfully pressed by his great predecessors. The novel element in the situation was that he met with a more uncompromising rudeness, a cold contempt, and violent measures which showed an utter want of respect, and that he was baffled and subdued by them. The scene at Canossa had such a staggering effect, because the penitent man in the snow was the son of the powerful Henry the Third. The scene at Anagni is the reverse of that at Canossa, because an abyss suddenly yawned at the feet of one who sat in judgment upon kings, and threatened to engulf him. The pontifical attire in which Boniface—so it is said—allowed himself to be taken prisoner only served to heighten the impression of a hollow greatness.

Though Boniface himself, with the help of the



Anagnese, soon escaped from his French captivity, and was permitted to die a free man, his successors shared the same captivity though, indeed, in milder forms—a Babylonian captivity it was called. This time, however, Babylon was on the Rhone; on its smiling banks at Avignon the pope, now more than ever before a *servus servorum*, was bound with fetters of gold. Rome had fallen, because in France it had ceased to find sufficient ground and support for its attack on the crown. Here it was confronted by a king with a nation behind him, and a nation including that episcopate whose possessions so closely connected it with the crown. Similar things had happened before in Germany. In France, however, it was a new thing for the king to be in a real sense a monarch or to be on the road to becoming one, to be no longer the highest part of a pyramid of uncertain feudal relations, but a central ruling power who was surrounded by a thoroughly submissive body of officials, who sought to make the great vassals and feudal lords his subjects, and at the same time showed that he was the friend of the aspiring lower classes. The modern state is dawning.

But while France was deriving political advantages simply from a pope who was French in sentiment but put forward absolute claims, as he had done before from Rome, the morally fettered representative of God was completely forfeiting the sympathies of the other princes. A national pope was obviously no pope at all. During the reigns of the Edwards, the idea of a papal supremacy was abandoned by England, which in the reign of the great third ruler of this name (1327-77) entered upon her hundred

years' war with France, strengthened as a nation and more popularly governed than her foe; and in the reign of Louis the Bavarian even Germany enjoyed a kind of national revival in the struggle with the pope and with France. In this case the profit accrued to the Electors at Rense in the year 1338. In Germany and Italy, no longer affected by the pope's power from Middle Italy, the princely and municipal governments had learned to realize and defend their independence from Rome.

*Papal mismanagement*, which was growing worse, was a special incentive to this. Deprived of a church state's financial support, used by the French lord as a means for screwing taxes out of Christians, morally unscrupulous in the methods it employed, the ecclesiastical administration became a formal system of robbery which reached its climax when to the one successor of Peter at Avignon was added a second at Rome. This was the beginning of that *schism in the Church* which lasted for forty years. One general Apostolic and Catholic Church with two absolute popes involves a contradiction; when the two monarchs fling the curse of excommunication at one another, each neutralizes the other's power. As a matter of fact, at the end of the fourteenth century people in France simply declared themselves neutral, dispensed with a pope, and soon afterwards they went to the same lengths in Germany as well. The head of the Church was a mere figure-head or crumbled away entirely.

Even in the reign of Louis the Bavarian, Marsilius of Padua and William of Occam were the means of voicing *theories* regarding the relationship of church

and state, which, starting from Aristotle's definition of the state, assigned to the Church and the pope within the Church entirely new positions, proceeded to reject the idea of a hierarchy altogether, and developed such radical statements as this: "The law of the gospel is the law of freedom." The intolerable distress caused by the schism gave these theories their full force. Ideas arise which are quite modern and extreme: a representative system must be introduced into the Church, and the laity be adequately represented; the truth can be handed on simply by the female part of the community; unworthy popes may be deposed, imprisoned, and even killed. Ultimately it was an Emperor, as Dante had hoped, who had compassion on the misery of the Church, and really converted the theories into practice,—the Emperor Sigismund. For the first attempts to frame a new Catholic constitution were made at the European Church Councils which were inaugurated upon German soil and under his directions, at the *Council of Constance* (1414–1418), and afterwards at the *Council of Basle* (1431–1449). It was proposed that a constitutional should be substituted for an absolute monarchy—by the cardinals, with d'Ailly at their head; or a parliamentary government be introduced—by Gerson, the chancellor of Paris, and his followers. The forms of the modern state are now appearing.

The final result of this controversy regarding the constitution was that the papacy was re-established. In the second half of the fifteenth century we hear of a papal *Restoration*. But the papacy was not the same power as before. *The states derived a clear gain* from the struggles of this period of reform, just

as the German princes did from the embarrassments of the pope two hundred years before in the reign of Frederick II., and again one hundred years before in the reign of Louis the Bavarian. They made the Constance principle, that the Council was supreme over the pope, the means of escaping the yoke of Rome, and then used the papacy for the purpose of depriving of the results of its labours the Universal Council, which when it became a permanent constitutional organ, threatened to become equally burdensome. France went to greater lengths than any other country. When in the year 1438, a century after the German transaction at Rense, the "pragmatic sanction" of Bourges allowed the crown to gather nearly all the material profit of the Basle reform, another landmark was reached in the development of the relationship between church and state. In proportion as the modern idea of the state began to gain acceptance, the prince became less disposed to allow the affairs of his church to be managed by anyone but himself. *His church!* The system of territorial churches, which we have found at all times to be by its very nature opposed to Romanism, is revived; it is re-established on a broader basis, and destined never again to disappear, but to become more and more complete.

Moreover, Romanism now, notwithstanding its restoration, had lost all power of offering any serious resistance. The second result of the period of reform was that the restored pope, through being sovereign of the church state, was himself carried along in the stream of development towards territorialism. The multiplicity of small powers in Italy, powers no

longer held together by the control of an emperor, became a danger to the church state itself. Here was a rich field in which Italian intrigue and political rancour might expatiate! As had happened before the time of Otto the First, the papacy, through being so much occupied with problems of immediate importance, had lost the power of viewing things as a whole. General considerations were almost lost sight of; nepotism and the most disgraceful dissoluteness prevailed at Rome, and the state of things was aggravated by the new humanism. A classical example is provided by that abominable Borgia who occupied the throne of St Peter, Alexander VI., father of Cæsar and Lucrezia.

Thus the constitution or *form* of the Church was very severely shaken; in other words, the framework of the whole system of the Middle Age. At the same time there was evidence enough to show that there could be no hope that the derangements would be cured by a mere change in the constitution, by going back to the stage reached by Cyprian and the Council of Nicæa, that is to say, of old Catholic Episcopalianism, even if modern improvements were added. All that this liberal, anti-curial Catholicism, which survived as a sentiment and programme, did, was to supply the state with a good and lasting weapon to use against Rome, and to provide it with a resource or mask for any new efforts that might possibly be made!

When the framework was shattered, the Christian life and thought which it had protected were to an increasing extent disturbed and disquieted. The theories of church politicians again and again included

the thought that the laity had rights of their own in the Church, and by this means the right of state control was reasoned out and established. Practical effect was given to the idea in the standing orders of the reform councils: they were made more and more democratic, as well as more and more national. They showed clearly what was at the root of the whole development: *the efforts of the lay world to escape from the ecclesiastical shackles of which it had grown weary*. These began in the age of the Hohenstaufen, with its knightly culture. When the cities began to flourish and a specific form of civil culture arose first in Italy and then in Germany, the circumstances which, as even we may feel, justified the supremacy of the Church in the Middle Age had completely changed: culture had ceased to be the peculiar possession of the clerical class. The Church had itself brought the lay world to maturity, and had thus prepared its own downfall.

Knightly and civic corporations were in large measure the products of the Crusades. Trade with the Levant brought to light a new world which possessed spiritual as well as material virtues. The Christians of the West entered into the closest contact with a world which was not Catholic or Christian, and it was impossible not to appreciate this Arabian culture, even though it was not fostered under the guiding hand of Rome. Part of the Oriental problem of the time was the question of relations with the Greek empire of the East, which lay on the road to the Holy Land. At times it had come under the rule of the West. The know-

ledge of the Greek language and literature had made continual progress. Familiarity with the original works of Aristotle, which was first promoted by the Arabians, was followed now, in the fifteenth century, by knowledge of the original works of Plato, the *pagan* idealist, who, when he poured forth those spiritual treasures found in his Dialogues, had no idea of the Christian dogmas. When the Turks made their inroads, Greek knowledge, which still contained an endless number of learned traditions and now received new impulses, to a great extent sought refuge in Italy. Here since the fourteenth century people had already begun to look back with enthusiasm to the heroic days of the classical period, which was partly buried in rubbish but in its magnificent remains still spoke a living language to him who had ears to hear it. Here the way had been paved for a really popular *renaissance*. Cola di Rienzi, the Roman tribune of the people in the days of Louis the Bavarian, owned the first modern collection of inscriptions. To the existing non-Christian world of Islam was added the non-Christian Græco-Roman world of old which, in spite of its paganism, was so beautiful and so proud. There was nothing that could unite Catholics with these worlds, so full of the joy of life, but the purely human, the *humane* sentiment.

And it was this very interest in the purely human element, the appreciation of individual life in all its forms and phases, that was making continual progress in the West. *Nominalism* was a sign that people, perplexed to know what to think of the naïve supernatural assumptions of earlier scholasticism, had

come to reflect upon the facts of consciousness. The majority of people, of course, who were timid, and had not found any new foundation for certain knowledge, had resigned themselves all the more zealously to the authority and practices of the Church. When, therefore, nominalism triumphed, there developed an increase in Church *superstition*, a convulsive form of bigotry, an odious compact between opportunism and obscurantism. The practice of making pilgrimages, granting indulgences, and venerating relics, assumed terrible dimensions. Such events as the great rush to see the Holy Blood of Wilsnack in Brandenburg, or the piper of Niklashausen in the Tauberthal, must be regarded as pathological; they are epidemics of spiritual disease. On the other hand, however, a party arose of stronger minds who could not, like others, bring themselves to that violent act, the leap into the charmed circle of church authority, but yet stopped short at criticism and examining their own consciousness. Since people must have a God, they made gods of themselves. Petrarch, the father of *Humanism*, thought one's own ego the one worthy object of our reflection. This meant, of course, that all ethical norms were of a fluctuating nature. Boccaccio is a witness of this, not only because he describes sensuality, but also in the way in which he describes it. His dissolute monks at least had the "law of Christ" and the rule of their Order over them, but the supermen of the Renaissance, of the Quattro- and Cinquecento, who in their own way converted the theory of their own sovereignty into practice, in doing so became in some cases beasts instead of gods.



Thus there is a wide gulf fixed between scholasticism and humanism, church piety and free human development. How widespread the latter became, even in the more sober land of Germany, is seen in a classical example at the beginning of the sixteenth century, that of the "epistolæ virorum obscurorum."

Petrarch's favourite book was the great autobiography or Confessions of Augustine. By examining their own ego people might also discover the facts of sin and the consciousness of guilt, of the need of redemption and of the powers of grace, as the great African actually did. Augustine's true nature was reawakened, and he paved the way for a more profound theology which was inaugurated by the work of the "doctor profundus," Thomas of Bradwardine († *circa* 1350), found a home in England, and reached its zenith on the threshold of the Reformation in the work of the Dutch scholar Wessel Gansfort.

Augustine's *mysticism* cannot be separated from his doctrine of grace, the depths of which are here sounded anew. This also, and in a true sense, for the first time meant absorption in the individual ego. *Monasticism* had ever been the special nursing-place of mysticism. The monks, depressed by the hopeless confusion and corruption of the Church, often returned to that state of abnegation to which monasticism really owed its existence, adopting one of two forms, the one more private, the other more public. In both forms, however, close connection with the Church was either loosened or broken: piety, like thought, became emancipated. People fled from the world and from a worldly church to

plunge into deep thought and reflect upon the secrets of our "heart." The mystics in the cloisters on the Rhine, who were such wonderful products of German spirituality, did not show any opposition to the Church; they simply did not require it: God, whose dwelling is within us, redeems us from our self-will which is our worst disease, from our "selfishness." The all-important phenomena in the life of the human soul are again found to consist in direct experiences, the primitive things which warm and fill the heart, and which were untouched by the intellectual subtleties of scholastic theology; and the new psychological discoveries, the primal realities of the heart, are expressed in language which everyone can understand at once, the one language which appeals to the heart, the language of the people. Master Eckart of Cologne is also master of the German language, and Tauler was a worthy disciple. But now the active spirit dwelling in the monks of the West bestirred itself *against* the Church. In this quarter *opposition* to a hierarchy burst into a fierce flame; throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the strict Franciscans wage war against an anti-Christian and secularized Church, and at the end of the fifteenth century the angry voice of the Old Testament prophets sounds again in the Dominican Savonarola of Florence, the stern champion of God and freedom, whom God had set in grand antithesis to the most reprobate of all popes, Alexander VI.

Whence came the stimulus and the armour? If monasticism had given back to the Church its own oldest ideal, that of a communion of saints, the cry,

*Back to the old original form of apostolic life*, was appropriate from the first. The cry of a living form of piety, "Back to the simplicity of the apostles," became louder in proportion as a knowledge of the early times of Christianity increased, and the difference between the present life of the Church and the childhood of the Christian religion viewed in an ideal way, was more keenly felt. It is the thought that urges on the Waldenses as well as St Francis. The Waldenses did special service, from which recent inquiry into their Catholic character detracts nothing, in being the first to bring into the light the one authority which could supply a correct knowledge of original Christianity, the *Bible*, and to make the people acquainted with it. What is known as the Scripture principle appeared long before the Reformation—in some cases, as in that of Marsilius, in a very crude form; and the learned Bible studies which reached their height in the works of Erasmus and Reuchlin are based on a study of the original language, and run counter to tradition, were not a product of the Reformation, but a pre-condition of it. Even the plain man learned enough to be able to feel how tremendous was the discrepancy between the simple forms of the earliest times and the pomp and glory of the Curia, between the simple moral utterances of Christ and the ceaseless flow of priestly dissertations. People, of course, were not able as yet to read the Scriptures. Old and New Testaments were still placed on the same footing; the Old Testament contained, of course, many references to priests and altar-service; the New Testament was the "new law," of an ethical

and spiritual nature, it is true, but still a code of outward observances, which had to be conformed to in a literal way, Christ being the central object in this sense; the whole was not as yet regarded as an organic growth springing from a single religious centre. The gold had not as yet returned to its fluid state.

Nor in this respect did the labours of the two venerable men who have the next claim to places on the pedestal of Luther make any difference. During the lives of Wyclif and his most noteworthy disciple, John Huss, most of the new notes with which we have already become familiar, strike in harmony: we have a strong national enthusiasm, a new theology inspired by Augustine, and ideas of apostolic reform based upon the Scripture principle. This harmony raises them far above all others, and gives their work an overpowering force and a far-reaching effect. But even they have not reached the vital points, far back though they went into the history of Christianity, even to that first pre-Catholic form in the second century; they still regard the essence of Christianity as consisting in the "new law," and their piety is still "catholic" in sentiment.

But there had arisen in the rectory at Lutterworth a laymen's Bible Christianity of an English type, and in the German city of Constance a single man had stood firmly by the principle that "he could not possibly do anything to violate his conscience, for which he was responsible to God," in defiance of emperor, empire, nations and church. "Religion cannot be compelled," said Lactantius long before to the pagans; nor even the Roman Catholic

by any external authority, whether pope or council, reiterated Huss. If the people were ever ready to seek new altars, truth at the same time was in motion; new ideas had in a real sense been converted into new forces, which enabled men to stand firm in the time of storm, and which could never more be lost.

## XIV

### END OF THE UNION OF THE CHURCHES OF THE WEST, AND THE FORMA- TION OF CONFESSION-CHURCHES AS A RESULT OF REFORMATION AND COUNTER-REFORMATION

AT no point in the historical development of Christianity is it more necessary to halt a moment, review the road traversed, and take note of our bearings.

Our last inquiry may be taken to show that even the classical period in which the Evangelical Church of Germany was founded, did not come without preparation, and that even Luther had forerunners. Nevertheless his greatest predecessors, Wyclif and Huss, did not equal Luther in genius. All the ideas which we have dealt with down to the present as regards the origin of the Catholic Church, and primarily of the principles of Catholic piety, reveal a common characteristic: a Catholic interpretation of the gospel of Christ.

The gospel appeared in the world as a proclamation of the mercy and grace of God bestowed upon men in spite of their sinfulness. It therefore started with the assumption of a relationship, an ethical

relationship subsisting between two persons, God and man, the nature of which is chiefly described in an ethical way : God is love, man is a sinner. The new relationship is represented by Christ and his apostles as being that of a penitent child towards a forgiving parent ; the thought of the natural relations, according to which the child is also indebted to its father for its origin, and is physically dependent upon him, is present at the same time. Since the grace of God "in Christ," that is to say, as incorporated in Him, smote men's hearts, so that they opened them to it and devoted themselves again to faith "in Christ," looking to Him as the author and finisher of this faith of theirs, it resulted that they made this representative of God to them their representative also in the sight of God, their mediator. The harmony of the inner life, which was greatly disturbed by the consciousness of religious and moral perversity, could be restored by the stronger consciousness of forgiveness and of the certainty of salvation : "peace and joy in the Holy Ghost," together with righteousness, were the characteristics of "the kingdom of God." The objective-divine feature, the grace of God, and the subjective-human, the faith of man, have a very direct bearing upon one another as moral forces ; and this interaction of divine grace and human freedom supplies strength for a new life, strength which gives an impulse throughout the whole range of thought and conduct. This spiritual relationship of man to God involves positive relations towards his brethren or the world : he has to win them for God in the same way that he himself has been won.

As soon as the gospel was carried to Græco-

Roman soil, this consciousness of being related to God as a child ceased to be clearly expressed. Non-Jewish people had not had the benefit of that long training which had prepared the Jews for an ethical interpretation of the divine and human natures, and so of their relationship. God is the highest abstraction, the first cause, the absolute substance; man is the creature subject to decay and doomed to ignorance. The character of the cure which is provided is adapted to the physical and intellectual malady; the gift of grace bestowed by the unbegotten Father consists in His implanting the divine nature in the human through Christ's incarnation and revealing His own hidden being in the great teacher, Christ the Logos, the word of His eternal reason; the appropriation of this gift of grace on the part of man consists in a mysterious process of filling oneself with the nature of Christ and an acceptance of the truth of Christ's revelation. The moral centre of man is thus left untouched, no power is given for a new life in righteousness and holiness, and yet the great teacher who was the Judge and held the book of life in His hand required righteousness and holiness in the highest sense, and to the fullest extent. Thus, in so far as people did not yield to the temptation to make some deduction from the strict and general application of ethical demands, they were taught to gain actual admittance by the works of their own freedom to the paradise of communion with God. In this way the objective and the subjective fall apart, as it were; the divine and the human processes no longer meet and combine in the depth of the soul.

Now after more than a thousand years this form of



piety, which even from its origin had missed the right path, from which on the soil of new peoples it had not been possible to escape, had taken a logical line of development. The divine grace was implanted in the world in a powerful and visible form, as an institution of salvation having a perfectly objective holiness which, possessing as it did in its teaching the absolute truth about God, and in its sacraments with their magic effect the power of deification, was ordained to rule the world. On the other hand, as compared with this, the subjective factor was developed in an equally one-sided way in a doctrine of rewards and punishments, satisfaction by penance and indulgence, in asceticism and monasticism. The Catholic Church does not rest upon one great pillar, but is balanced upon two props, neither of them giving certainty of salvation. Its strength is derived from the psychological fact that man varies in his moods. If anyone has any doubt of the objective gift which an infallible Church grants through priestly mediators, the gift which appeals to the impulse of knowledge and the direct life of the feelings, he can quickly betake himself to the subjective work which satisfies the impulse to action; again, if anyone despairs of being able himself to attain the gift of grace, he can betake himself quickly to the *opus operatum* of the sacrament. Between the two the practice of Roman Catholicism has woven so many threads in all directions that we receive the definite impression of a very complicated and artificial, if uniform, structure. In the case of the sacrament of penance, in particular, it succeeded in establishing the closest union; nevertheless, the

unity that arises is not a unity of conscience, but remains at root a mere sum in addition.

But the Church had secured the possibility of a radical reformation when it preserved the historical record of its origin and surrounded the documents which described it with the nimbus of inviolability. Although it had become "scripture," was bound and, as it were, slumbering, still the "word" spoken in former times by God to men, the gospel, was there and ready for the moment when it was destined to acquire new life. People still possessed it, though in such a way that they seemed not to possess it. Scripture alone does not make us "evangelical"; the experiences and conduct of our life must supply us with the key to unlock Scripture. Both then mutually explain one another.

After fourteen hundred years, Gentile-Christian humanity, both the ancient type and the Germanic which had been added in the Middle Age, had been sufficiently trained under the new law. Then the soul of a Thuringian peasant's son was stirred by the Spirit of God in such a way that he became a religious genius, or, as we prefer to say, the prophet of his age. Martin Luther was led by his intense feelings of sin and moral helplessness, of the wrath of God and need of redemption, which became his foundation truth and the real life of his soul, to find the key to the old forgotten story which spoke of the freely bestowed grace of God in Christ, the key to the spiritual meaning of grace and freedom. First a monk and then a priest, in the anguish of his heart he found the two supports, hierarchy and asceticism, to be rotten; but he was too clear-sighted and had too

strong a character to wander restlessly and in haste from one to the other or to embrace the delusion of imagining that two rotten supports would make one sound one. As regards man's most important relation, that subsisting between himself and God, he wished to have *certain knowledge* for life and death, and when this was not furnished by the voices of the Church, he was on the verge of despair, to which both before and after his time so many brethren of the cloister have fallen victims. Then his ears were opened to hear the voice of God Himself, coming first in broken accents from the mouths of men whose souls were still alive, but afterwards in fulness and purity from the Holy Scriptures. The thought that man could be the adopted child of God, or, as he expressed it in the language of Paul, was justified by faith, was the only solution of the mystery of their meaning. By means of what is known as the "material principle" he first learned to handle the long-established "formal principle." Judged by this principle, the worldly church and monasticism sank out of sight, and the Church of the pure gospel rose before his eyes. The seed of the Reformation was matured in the cloister-cell at Erfurt.

Christianity developed out of very small beginnings which are enveloped in obscurity, out of the spiritual life of one person Jesus, and out of the common faith of a handful of disciples ; in like manner the process by which Christianity was traced back to its original and simple forms started in the secret *experiences of the soul* of one man, Luther. He himself did not suspect for over a decade what a wealth of new ideas was buried within him. So little was he conscious

of being the revolutionary which the ultramontanes were pleased to take him for, that he was surprised at himself. He did not feel any further obligation to examine his environment in the light of the new facts, and bring the one to bear upon the other, until God called him from a narrow into a wider sphere, from Erfurt to Wittenberg, to Rome, to the professor's chair, to the pulpit and a post of control in his Order. But during the last centuries so much had become unstable, there was such a lack of clear dogmatic definitions, in both the ancient Church and the Church of the Middle Age, as regards the very question which he felt to be the most important of all, "In what way shall I attain the grace of God?" that is to say, the question how one could be certain of appropriating the gift of salvation, that, although he favoured reforms on the lines of Augustine, for a long time he was still able to regard himself as a good Catholic even in the ordinary sense in which the term had previously been used. The great African often helped him in a real way, as did his Wittenberg friends, to understand Paul, for in Paul, who had been guided to grace by the law, he found his own experiences minutely repeated. The Lutheran Church from the very first received a Pauline colouring. Luther was also helped and influenced by that German mysticism which through its spiritual and warm-hearted nature mitigated the harshness of theological formulas, and taught him to speak of the secrets of the soul in the popular style of his beloved German.

He also to some extent availed himself of Augustinian formulas, when Tetzl by his traffic in

indulgences made forgiveness of sins, of all things the most holy and spiritual, a mere mechanical process, which did harm to and interfered with his own cure of souls, and when he posted his theses against this. But since indulgence represented the pinnacle of the whole Western system, the most tangible and palpable, the most hated, if also the most sought after and therefore the most popular, abuse in the Church of the Middle Age, his words were like a spark in a powder barrel. From this time to the year 1521, even to 1525, *the movement is identical with the history of Luther*. His collision with the offended authority of the Church shows already how much he had achieved in private. To the astonishment of his contemporaries, who were excited on the one side to the extent of jubilant applause, on the other to that of deadly hatred, he unfolded the great struggles of his soul in masterly, popular, childlike, yet thoroughly manly language. Since the day in the year 1518 when he stood face to face with the Roman legate Cajetan, the claim of Rome, as far as he was concerned, had been dashed to the ground. But the real critical occasion when the Reformation first became a historical fact, was that of the *Leipzig Disputation*, when, following in the footsteps of Huss and yet going far beyond him, with hesitancy and yet with boldness, Luther emancipated himself from both pope and Council at the same time, and so from the idea of any kind of hierarchy, and threw himself upon his own resources.

*The triumph of that glorious year 1520-21* was the fruit of this fight for the conscience. The threefold programme of Luther, which was explained in his

three great writings, "To the Christian Nobility," "On the Babylonian Captivity," and "On the Freedom of a Christian Man," a programme of an ecclesiastico-political, a dogmatic and a moral nature, let loose a spiritual storm the like of which Germany has never seen. "Sweet as violets and roses in comparison with this was the rebellion of Henry IV. against Gregory VII.," lamented the nuntius Aleander. "Farewell, unhappy Rome!" exclaimed Luther. "The die is cast, and I hazard all!" was the challenge of Hutten, applauded by the humanists, who had formed an alliance with the nationalists. All the longing and heart-burning accumulated in the souls of the people finds vent; all that is meant by freedom and progress, that presses onward and upward, chafed by the fetters that bind the feet, attached itself to the great and bold monk, and applauded him as the saviour of Germany. For a short time he gathered up all the interests which we have observed to be awakening — national, democratic and humanistic, mystical and pious, apocalyptic and enthusiastic. Luther was no longer lonely in *Worms*; even in the hour when he who "had grown up in the retreats of monks" stood face to face with his emperor and the representatives of his nation, he felt himself to be strengthened and supported by the love of his friends. *The whole history of the German people now converges in the Reformation of Luther.* There was need of someone thus to gather up all the forces; there was need of this overflow of enthusiasm, in both its clear and turbid forms, amongst princes and scholars, citizens and peasants, to achieve the mighty work: the soul of the

German people, a soul so prone to piety and love, had to be separated from its mother of old, the Church of Rome, and from a subservient devotion which had lasted for a thousand years.

Since Luther was forced into exile in the Wartburg, Germany was compelled to solve the question whether it was the man or the cause. And the answer must be that it was the cause. The Reformation, however many its fluctuations, could not be rooted out. The foundations of the *new building* were laid in particular communities, and in Wittenberg first. After Luther's return in the year 1522, with his German Bible he put into every man's hand the means of seeing whether the course that was being taken was the right one. This was a real declaration that the laity had come of age. The gold had now indeed become really fluid in his hand! The eternal book ceased to hover over him as a mystery that must be worshipped, but could not be understood—he felt it to be history, to be part of that stream of life in which he himself stood, and which, like his own life and the life of all men, was to be understood from the one point of view: does it compel faith in Christ, and so minister to our salvation? Moreover, Philip Melanchthon, who after 1518 worked by the side of Luther in Wittenberg and in closest sympathy with him, in 1521 undertook a summary of theological thought in his admirable work, *Loci communes*, which Luther described as “a book invincible, of imperishable, even of canonical value.” Melanchthon discovered a fundamental mistake; this was that soon after the origin of Christianity the philosophy of Plato had been

introduced into it. And by making fundamental Christianity consist in the benefits of Christ and the facts of our ethical and religious consciousness, our experiences in relation to these, he was able again to describe it as a practical relationship, and theology in like manner as the doctrine of our salvation. In principle this meant a *re-interpretation and transvaluation of all previous concepts and values*. Dogma has ceased to be a juristically binding code of doctrine; it has become a Church's heartfelt confession of belief in the gift of grace which lives in it. Asceticism has ceased to be a self-tormenting and self-satisfied effort to attain perfection involving the destruction of sensuality; it has become a moral self-discipline applied even to the most minute questions of truthfulness and love in one's daily calling. The cultus has ceased to be an apparatus of magic, and has become a means of spiritual edification; the constitution has ceased to be a divine ordinance, and has become the temporal and historical form in which the eternal word is conveyed from Christ to the Church and to individuals. If the old names were preserved, their import had become different. The previous meaning of "Church"—that is to say, the visible and almighty queen of life who rules over men and hovers between earth and heaven—is abandoned; the Church is now an object of faith, not of sight, the invisible communion of those who have been won for God. The whole of Christianity is something quieter and simpler, spirit and inwardness, and therefore something free to enter into any number of relationships, its forces having free scope to permeate the whole being of the individual and



the people. The Wittenberg leaders gladly welcomed the new culture, humanism, and reconstituted both schools and university; as grateful allies, they did honour to the new state. A Christian man is free in all things, but subject to every man in love.

This is the *second classical period of Christianity*. Its study not only widens our hearts, but clears our vision, because, as in the earliest times, the auspiciousness and enthusiasm of the moment lifted this period out of history, so to say, and made the principles stand out in greater purity and with more irresistible force, still unimpaired by compromise and unhampered by temporal conditions.

But *conflicts* were already approaching. They were necessary and helpful, for only by their means could the gospel take firm root; only under such conditions had it been able to take root in the second and third centuries. On the other hand, it must not be supposed that in those same forms which bear such clear evidence of being due to transitory and temporary conditions we have the last word spoken to the end of all time. A period now commences in which humanists are sharply divided from social and political enthusiasts for freedom. We can only think of the year 1525 with sorrow, the year of the most bloody revolution experienced by Germany. It marked the tragic turning-point in Luther's life. He lost his popularity because he stood between the parties, argued with the princes and forbade the peasants to riot; finally, because when they became insurgents he used language to them which was almost wild; "My lord Omnes," the "mob," conceived a hatred of him, and he in turn came to

despise it. After this Luther became a Conservative in principle, who made no distinction between enthusiast and Swiss, and with childlike trust handed over the care of the new Church to the Christian authorities.

The *state* now derived clear profit from the Reformation, as it had done from the period of reform. A Church which handed over to it its rich worldly adornments, the whole of its landed property, and even the control of the bishop's office, deserved to be helped as much as possible. To an increasing extent the opportunism of the princely and free-city politics, of their efforts towards sovereignty or "liberty," as they called it, allied itself to the religious interest. From this double standpoint, in the imperial diets, especially in that of Speyer in 1529, the politicians championed the cause of the gospel, and made a form of *Protestantism a factor of political power*. When the Emperor Charles was free from his entanglements with France and the pope and able to proceed against heretics, he would already have been obliged to exterminate the evangelical territorial churches and confessions. This came to an end at Augsburg in the year 1530. The consequence of his threatening attitude was that the obstacles which had down to this date prevented the establishment of an evangelical alliance at Schmalkalden were finally overcome. The division between the Middle and Low Germans—who were of the school of Wittenberg, and whose form of faith had also been adopted by the Scandinavians—and the South and High Germans, who favoured Zwingli's views, was healed; and Zurich, deprived as it was of its leader Zwingli,

who fell in battle, abandoned higher politics, after developing on Swiss soil a valuable form of new church.

The following twelve, or rather fifteen years, down to the year 1545, are the *years of Protestant power*. At the time of the Ratisbon conference, in the year 1541, when even the papal legate Contarini admitted the *sola fide*, it looked as if the whole of Catholicism would come to an end, at least in the empire; when the Schmalkaldian war was on the point of breaking out, as far as the people were concerned, those who still cherished the old doctrine in German lands formed a minority which was daily becoming smaller. The territorial churches were firmly rooted, the doctrines having been incorporated in a number of confessions, amongst which the small Catechism by Luther became the real confession of the people, and the Augsburg confession the real confession of the Church; the Apology, on the other hand, may be considered to be the most mature product of the theological settlement.

But the purity of the principles had been clouded. The Catholic distortions of the gospel, which had not as yet been removed, recovered ground, just as pagan ideas did in the second and third centuries.

It is well known that Luther's strong inclination to allow as much of the old Church as possible to remain and to lay as great stress as possible on the objective side of the sacrament, was greatly increased by the horror he felt at the iconoclastic barbarism and extravagant subjectivism of the enthusiasts. In spite of his attacks on "the abomination of the Mass," he did not altogether rise above a material view of

the means of grace ; and the people of Nuremberg, in observing evangelical "Mass" down to the second half of the eighteenth century, with early and mid-day celebrations, Magnificat, the chanting of Latin psalms, and vestments as in 1524, were able to imagine that they were good conservative Lutherans. In Luther the need of satisfying his æsthetic sense was associated with a passionate desire to be made certain in a very direct way that he possessed the gift of grace.

In his theology itself he never hides the fact that he had passed through the stage of mysticism, still less perhaps that he had been a schoolman of the nominalist party. This explains how it was that the old intellectualism gained new strength. The grand attempts at a reconstruction of doctrine made in the first years had not matured, the theology handed down from the ancient Church had not as yet been revised from the new standpoint when Luther's dispute with Erasmus led him to speak of the "hidden God" of absolute predestination behind the "revealed God" of grace in Christ, and the conflict with the Swiss brought him back, as Zwingli jeeringly expresses it, *ad Scotica et Thomistica*, that is to say, to the scholasticism of Duns Scotus and Thomas Aquinas. Theology and faith are again united ; faith again consists of "articles" : whosoever "holds, believes, and teaches" them, may be regarded as a Christian ; so say the Schwabach articles of the year 1529. According to Melanchthon pure doctrine is the characteristic mark of the Church. Holding a position midway between Romanists and enthusiasts, the men of Wittenberg zealously contended that their

doctrine was connected with that of the ancient Church; they wished to prove that their Christianity was genuine and pure by appealing to the old symbols which were simply taken over and to which new ones were added, so that a whole *corpus* of confessions of very varied character and derivation was formed, which was very elaborate, and in part could hardly be understood by laymen.

But this development was particularly disastrous because, since the "Evangelical Church" was much divided in its constitution, and in its "ceremonies" was subversive of any kind of uniformity, it was the more anxious to attain unity in doctrine, if in nothing else. The new form of Church, having been rejected by the emperor and the empire, was committed to the charge of the small German powers. This *alliance between Protestantism and particularism*, though it proved to be its salvation, brought a number of other ills in its train. Court rivalries affected even theology, giving rise to that deplorable growth, a court theology, of which "Master Grickele"—the Agricola of Brandenburg—is an early example. The spirit in the churches, great and small, becomes not only petty and narrow, but even worldly; the state, instead of being the theocratic protector, becomes a kind of policeman, and there emerges on the horizon a new period of state church which was obliged to obstruct any development that might lead people to regard things from an inner spiritual standpoint.

But the popularity of the new Church was endangered in proportion as it tended to lean for support on the court, and to convert faith into a

theology again. From the year 1525 to 1535 the Anabaptist movement spread rapidly, and even after the catastrophe of Münster there was still an under-current in many quarters, especially in South Germany. But there were other causes to explain this. Many of the morally earnest elements amongst the people sought refuge in these communities. The reproach was again and again made by all classes that moral demoralization increased as a result of the preaching of faith. Consequently it was again abandoned in favour of the old legal explanation of the gospel, and a substitute or supplement was found in a moralism of a biblical character. Once more the separate parts were loosened. Once more it became clear that a Christianity of doctrine and devotion to cultus endangered its identification with moral life. In the process of deciding between different theological opinions the Evangelicals themselves displayed the old harshness, lack of love, and spirit of defamation. In the case of the bigamy of the Landgrave of Hesse, however, there was a most fatal exposure. It was only another instance of that divine judgment which rules in the world and throughout history, when it happened at the precise point at which the *Counter-reformation* in Germany started.

The growth of confession-churches did not end with the formation of German and Scandinavian churches of the Lutheran type, and of small Swiss churches of a Zwinglian stamp. There was a second period in the development of these churches. When the *Catholic Church*, after its crushing defeat, was formulated in one definitive confession, it was enabled

to attempt not merely to claim all that was left of its possessions, but even to try to regain the ground which had been lost. But it was not successful because, on the basis of Calvin's work, from within the older reform movement a new confession had arisen in Romanic and Anglo-Saxon and in part also in German Europe—a "reformed" Church which was of unfading importance, because it was a *fighting Church opposed to the Roman Counter-reformation*.

The measures of the strict Catholic Emperor Charles V. against the heresy of Protestantism had not succeeded, because, being a universal monarch and, like Charles the Great, full of theocratic ideals, he came into conflict, not only with the national state of France, but also with the pope, regarded as the universal bishop and the owner of the church-state, the neighbour of the Spanish Naples. We are justified in repeating the paradoxical statement that Pope Clement VII. saved German Protestantism — by his hostility to the emperor. Ultimately Charles undertook the work of reform without the help of the pope, started conferences on religion, and after the victory over the Protestants in the Schmalkaldian war (1547), tried to introduce during the Interim of Augsburg an *imperial intermediate religion*, thinking to save all that was left. The reason he was able to go so far was that he made skilful use of his opponents' weaknesses: the hands of the one leader of the Protestants, the Hessian, had been tied by the marriage affair we have mentioned, and he had been deprived of his strength; against the other, the Saxon, he was able to use the princely ambition of his nephew and actually to make

Maurice the traitor to the cause of the faith. But having taken this path, only half-measures were possible, and Charles was content to fight even with blunt weapons, when he had no others to rely upon.

But during the same forty years a movement which had originated in a different quarter was already operating in such a way as to revive the life in the feeble body of the old Church and to capture the papacy for its own idea; the same thing had happened once before in the tenth and eleventh centuries. The fanatically Catholic spirit of the *Spanish* fighters with the Moors in the South-West corner of Europe, from which—from the turrets of Granada—the crescent did not disappear until the end of the fifteenth century, had become possessed of the forms of the new humanistic culture, and had introduced a real reform. The periods are here jostled together in a remarkable way: the Middle Age, which had here not been spiritually overcome and still continually derived life from the enthusiasm of the Crusades, finds itself brought almost without any preparation into the most direct contact with the new age and confronted with its greatest problems: Madrid suddenly becomes the centre of the European system of states, and a new world emerges on the other side of the sea! This explains the fact that here alone people were sufficiently unprejudiced to be able to appreciate and accept merely the beautiful form of the new culture without being much affected by its substance. The monastic and clerical spirit which staked everything on the honour of the Church, losing itself, its personal form of expression, in the universal, and the spirit of humanism which developed the



personal forces and respected peculiarities wherever they contained human elements, though in every other part of the world they were mortal enemies, here formed a strange and unnatural alliance. Since it was founded upon a great delusion, it was bound to produce fallacious results. Ignatius of Loyola, the founder of the "Company of Jesus," the Jesuits, provides the typical figure of the movement. Here the strictest military discipline, which even required people to destroy their own will and feeling, accomplished the feat of supporting the old system of Church and faith by means of humanism; so that this Catholicism being thus really restored, through preaching, confessional chair, and instruction, acquired power in the old world to inspire the crusade against the Protestants and to conquer the new world.

Almost at the same time the Southern lands were purged of the heretic poison by the terrible work of the Inquisition, and *Trent* decided what was to be held to be Catholic in distinction from the new faith, which was only bastard faith. In future there could not possibly exist any theoretical oscillation such as had prevailed for three hundred years regarding the question as to how the gift of salvation was to be appropriated; the question which had so long been undecided was now settled. A resolute stand was thus made against Protestants, and Jesuits had become the spiritual guides. Since, however, this great supplementation of the dogma of the ancient Church was made under the pressure of external troubles and for practical purposes, its own intellectual work was slight. The material was supplied

by the medieval combination of Romanism and scholasticism; the choice was dictated by hostility to Protestantism. Thus in dealing with sin and justification, support was given to moralism by allowing both the freedom of the will and the doctrine of rewards and punishments to have free play, and by rejecting in definite terms the certain knowledge of salvation. Especially were the sacraments — from the seventh to the twenty-fourth session — dealt with, and only the existing usages were set forth and sanctioned. Much was left untouched, but future mischief was prevented by the declaration placed at the head of all decisions, that tradition was a second source of revelation equal in value to Scripture: the Bible could no longer be placed in opposition to the Church; the facts of history could no longer be contrasted with the facts of practice which ultimately depended upon the pope. The whole thing, therefore, both explanation and supplementation, was then and for all time committed to the care of the pope; and the papacy, having once more become conscious of its work in the world, rounded it off with the help of vows and catechism, index and breviary. This is the *last great occasion on which the faith of Catholicism was defined*. Present-day Catholicism is the Catholicism of Trent, and that of Trent was the Catholicism of the Middle Age in its Romanist development and with the exclusion of its evangelizing elements.

The name Catholic Church involves the old claim that the truth was to be found only in this one ancient Church; the Protestants provided a field for mission work. The treaty of Passau in the year

1552, which Maurice, at that time leader of the Protestants, dictated to the emperor, and the religious peace at Augsburg in 1555, destroyed or impaired this fiction, and in reality *two confession-churches* were firmly established *in the West*—the Roman and that of adherents of the confession of Augsburg. But, in the first place, Rome herself never recognized these political arrangements, and, in the second, the peace contained so many obscurities and omissions that it ought rather to be described as a cessation of hostilities or an interim.

During this interim, and down to the time of the last great day of reckoning, the Jesuits were able to continue their sapping operations and prepare the soil. In Germany portions of evangelical territory continually crumbled away. In countries governed by a Catholic sovereign, Protestant subjects were not sufficiently protected, and in these circumstances the principle that “the ruler of a district may impose his own religion” (*cujus regio, ejus religio*) was bound to have a disastrous effect.

Meanwhile, however, Calvin and Geneva had given birth to a Protestant Fighting Church which was able to contend with that of the Jesuits. Beginning with French Lutheranism, affected by the work of Zwingli, and powerfully influenced by Bucer, the reformer of Strassburg, John Calvin, a man of such strong character that he stamped the movement with a mark of his own, became the creator of a “reformed” type which on both sides of the ocean played the greatest rôle in history, and in the extent to which it spread beyond its own country far outstripped Lutheranism.

The first explanation of this fact is provided by the external circumstance that the *sea-powers*, which at that time had just entered the period of transmarine colonization, had inherited this form of belief, especially England, which, in consequence, carried it over to North America. But other things have to be noted, and of a more inward nature. And amongst these the fact that Calvinism commended itself as the more logical form of *Anti-Romanism*, especially in the cultus, and particularly to those who had to deal with a Rome which had already awakened and become conscious of itself, with the Jesuits and the Counter-reformation. The intensified form of Catholicism was met by an intensified form of Protestantism, which claimed to be the true and first really "reformed" Reformation, as compared with Lutheranism, which had so largely compromised: concessions and half-measures now even more than before made people fear that they were losing the real thing in itself. In the third place, the nature and meaning of the *constitution* had to be examined from the point of view of Calvinism; originating in the free state of Geneva, by its republican independence, based on the divine law, it adapted itself to all the movements which started among the people, and had to fight for their existence against their own governments, to all "churches under the cross." This was the form in which the gospel was able to thrive even without the protection of the authorities.

Finally, the most abstract thing of all. The dogma of *election*, which was taken over from Augustine, but was supported by the absolutely infallible Scriptures,

takes a more and more central position, and, without doubt, obscures the grace of God revealed in Christ, by again making metaphysics the starting-point, though with equal certainty it possesses a power to kindle enthusiasm and create a stimulus for the greatest achievements. If it made the small bands of confessors feel quite certain that they belonged to the community of Israel, the people of God, which, on that account, fights His battles with enthusiasm and even with a fatalistic contempt of death, it impels them inwardly to make a very great effort of will, in order that they may represent the community of the saints. If holiness, and consequently *discipline*, was intrinsically a matter of central importance, the latter word now acquired a military sound. Here the people found what was so often missing in the state and theological churches of Lutheranism, but what it had sought among the Anabaptists, a close union between religion and morality, a system for disciplining private and public life under the law of Christ. It is obvious that if Lutheranism reintroduced the old intellectualism in doctrine and the old æstheticism in the observances of the cultus, the old moralism in the conception of the ideal of life, based like that on the much narrower lines drawn by Scripture, could not be omitted here. But the fact that the Old Testament was regarded as equal to the New, in the first place gave this biblical form of moralism some of the harsh features of Old Testament legalism, and, in the second place, strengthened the leaning towards mystical prophecy and apocalyptic, a leaning which was once more associated with moralism. The Calvinist churches, especially in the free land

of England, became the nurseries of every possible variety of such Catholicizing movements: of pure Anabaptistism, ascetic pietism, the Methodist doctrine of perfection, "Catholic Apostolic" Christianity, Adventism, and the Salvation Army. In saying this, we have described the peculiar character of Calvinism and touched upon its future development.

A perfect strategy had chosen Geneva as the sally-port for the attack against France and the Romanic world. Calvinism domiciled itself in France, the Netherlands, and England successively. In the reign of Edward VI. England had its Anglican state church, which tended to Calvinism in dogma, and was to a large extent Catholic in constitution and cultus. It was suppressed under "bloody" Mary. But this served to make the purely Calvinistic type popular here as well, and when the state church was restored in the reign of the great Elizabeth, Presbyterianism, with its headquarters in Scotland, where John Knox had naturalized strict Calvinism, was so active and powerful that henceforth there was a continually increasing effort to get rid of the leaven of papacy, a growing "Puritan" undercurrent flowing contrary to the official Episcopal Church.

This Calvinism, whose members even in the German empire were not protected by the religious peace of Augsburg, introduced the last great reckoning. The drama of the *world-struggle* between restored Catholicism and Protestantism is divided into two acts. The scene of the first is in the West; the time is the second half of the sixteenth century, the reign of Philip of Spain, who planned a great system with the design of reclaiming heretics. In

France, however, the Huguenots maintained their ground, spite the horror of the Massacre of St Bartholomew's Day; in the Netherlands the northern half freed itself from the Spanish and Catholic yoke and founded a free state which was very powerfully influenced by the Protestant spirit and, small as it was, for a hundred and fifty years took its place as one of the leading powers; the Armada was shattered on the coasts of Britain, and Mary Stuart was executed. Calvinism was saved, but Spain was economically ruined.

Meanwhile, the other Habsburg line, that of Austria, was conquered by the Jesuit spirit and enabled to give heresy in the East its death-blow. Austria then was alienated from the German evangelical spirit, and in fact already lost the imperial crown and her share in the future of Germany. Naturally the scene of the second act of this world-struggle was played in Germany, a *thirty years' war*. Lutheranism had made a poor preparation in the time allowed by God for the purpose. The division between milder and "original" Lutherans, Philipists or Melanchthonians and Gnesiolutherans, distracted it in the same decades, during which Calvinism forced its way into Germany from the Rhine. Here, again, the former of these parties was, amongst other things, seriously concerned lest an over-straining of the doctrine of justification should endanger morality; and, besides, there was opposition to the materialistic conception of the sacrament. Since Calvinism seemed to represent the right attitude as regards these particular points, we cannot be surprised that as a result of the

victory of the Gnesiolutherans in the matter of the Formula of Concord, most of the Philipist churches passed over to Calvinism. Thus arose the *German Reformed churches*; they were Lutheran and Melanchthonian in origin, and differed in confession and constitution from pure Calvinism, which naturalized itself from Holland only on the Lower Rhine. In this weakened form Calvinism gained victory after victory, and at the beginning of the seventeenth century had spread from Hesse beyond Brandenburg to Holstein and Mecklenburg (Güstrow). It was no longer Lutheran Saxony, which had become quite unreliable and was following in the wake of the Habsburgs, but the reformed Palatinate, that undertook to lead German Protestants. The first phase of the great war was Palatine-Bohemian.

German heresy was to be encompassed on all sides. On the eastern flank Sigismund, king of Poland, was won over; he was to bring his old claim to bear upon Sweden. But at the same time the Lutheran reserves in Scandinavia were called to the front, and the "Lion of the North," Gustavus Adolphus, was awakened. When Wallenstein, the Habsburg generalissimo, was made Admiral of the Baltic fleet and Duke of Mecklenburg, and opened a Baltic canal, Gustavus Adolphus thought the time had come to go to Germany and save both faith and fatherland. German interests had become his own; and we have very good reason to extol him as the saviour of German Protestantism.

The peace of Westphalia left Germany powerless. Its guarantees were France and Sweden. French influence, and to a less extent Swedish influence,



continued to prevail for a long time in Germany. But Lutheranism was saved as well as Calvinism. Henceforth Lutherans, Reformed, and Catholics—the three confessions—lived side by side, and the world proceeded on its way regardless of the protest of the pope against this fundamental political statute.

## XV

### VICTORIOUS PROGRESS OF PROTESTANT SUBJECTIVISM. PIETISM AND ENLIGHTENMENT

HENCEFORTH the history of Christianity may be said to become in one respect much simpler, in another much more complicated: much simpler as regards the Catholic world, much more complicated as regards the Evangelical. Only one question really results from a consideration of the Jesuit Roman Catholicism defined at Trent: Is the breathing of the organism stronger or weaker? Are its representatives unable to protect it against outside influences, and so to preserve it from drifting towards dissolution? Or do they, once more becoming conscious of their work, develop the existing system more thoroughly, remove the foreign elements that impair its effect, and fill up the gaps that still remain? We are even less able to speak of a "development" than in the case of the Middle Age, for when the evangelical opposition was overcome, the impetus provided by criticism, that is to say, the movement from within, was expelled. On the other hand, the Reformation period produced great and incomparable results: in the case of the one half of European Christianity, the northern, younger and tougher part, whose blood was mainly

Germanic, the bands which had been wound round the whole of life, but most closely round the part which every man felt to be most private and peculiar, his life with God, were broken. The word freedom is written in shining letters over the whole of the succeeding period. In the hundred and fifty years that extended from the great English to the great French Revolution, from Cromwell to Napoleon, from Descartes to Kant, from Milton to Goethe, a stream of spiritual forces, at length released from their intolerable bonds, burst forth and rushed with overpowering strength on Protestant soil. Just as in the first systematic loosening of the chains religion played the leading part, it did so again when a greater measure of emancipation was attained. While men struggled for freedom in the highest matter of the conscience, they cleared the way for every kind of mental freedom, and, on the other hand, after they had permitted themselves to look at the world with unprejudiced eyes, to investigate and criticize, they did not rest until the searchlight of "enlightenment" had been flashed upon the inmost soul of man and every opinion found there was "tolerated." Thus the history of Protestantism, which was much divided, and became increasingly more so, is closely interwoven with the whole history of the ideas of a new age, and a very varied process, hardly to be characterized in a few words, at the very time when the history of Catholicism becomes quite identical with the history of a "Church," breaks through the framework and belies the name of one.

We must begin with *England*. Whereas on the

Continent the political interest, which had become more and more prominent during the second half of the thirty years' war, had completely displaced the ecclesiastical, in this isolated island kingdom the religious question was still the first matter of public interest; indeed, England was only now experiencing its great really popular Reformation. The danger that the ruler might force back the state church, which outwardly catholicized, into the paths of the old Church, so that it should become inwardly so as well, a danger which had always threatened and had revived in the reigns of the descendants of Mary Stuart, was first removed in the era of Cromwell. We still find the waves of a Counter-reformation beating against the shores of Britain. But in this later period, when the Church and political circumstances in England were peculiar, they produced a different and far more radical movement.

It is a mistake to suppose that the direct result of the Lutheran Reformation was *personal* freedom in belief and conscience. The edict of Speyer in 1526 which allowed the *states* to hold it, making them responsible to God and his Imperial Majesty, was not framed in this sense, though the idea may be implied in the words of Luther, "God help me; I cannot do otherwise." Princes and towns fought, not for their subjects' personal freedom of belief, but for freedom to be allowed to teach the pure gospel in their territories, for freedom in confession and the existence of evangelical territorial churches. It is really simply the other side of this right of reformation, which started from a theocratic conception of magisterial government, and was justified when prince and

magistrate took care that the gospel was preached in their land in a *unanimous* way. The fact that this principle, in 1555, and, though much impaired, even in 1648 remained in force, was the result of the close alliance into which the Reformation had entered with the authorities, the new form of church with the state which had arisen in the territories of the Lutheran Church. The period of political absolutism, now emerging, afterwards made the territorial churches entirely state churches. This line of development really only led to Byzantine loss of freedom: only one who accepted this part of the legal order of things, the form of evangelical doctrine and cultus observance approved by the Serenissimus, can possibly have any place in this community, or at any rate be a full citizen entitled to hold office; in the case of such a one, churchmanship is his duty as a citizen. This want of freedom was the more discreditable, since the state to a greater and greater extent exchanged the religious and theocratic conception of its ecclesiastical power for that of a worldly and territorial one.

A freer movement could only be expected to develop on the soil of Calvinism. We must again recall the fact that here the essential thing consisted in the outward constitution of the Church; the offices, and first of all the office of presbyters, who are the maintainers of church discipline, are traced back to a direct command of the Lord, to the statements of infallible Scripture. If this involved a return to the Catholic standpoint, as it undoubtedly did, a relapse the more serious because, if necessary, the bishop's office, like that of the presbyter, could be

founded upon Scripture and consequently support found for an episcopally constituted Catholicizing Calvinism, it really meant the exclusion of the idea that the Church stood to the state in a relationship of service. Even pure Calvinism was captured by that tendency to found territorial and national churches which prevailed throughout the world: in Geneva itself, in Scotland, in Holland Calvinism became the state religion, and only tolerated the adherents of another form of faith if they were not fully qualified citizens. It was not, however, a matter of the state dominating the Church, but much rather of a theocracy on the pattern set up by Calvin in Geneva. If the authorities did not accept a man's particular form of belief, he was able, by means of the powerful independent presbyterial and synodal constitution, to pursue his life under the cross in such a way that "the Church was separated from the state" entirely; in certain circumstances even independent political and military rights were obtained, so that there was a state within the state, such as the republican Huguenot state in monarchical France from the Edict of Nantes in 1598 to the Edict of Nîmes in 1629. So powerful was the political spirit of ecclesiastical Calvinism that, invading the territory of the state, it promoted republican leanings everywhere and came forward as the political opponent of an absolute monarchy. It was this spirit that gave birth to the glorious struggle for freedom in the Netherlands, the result of which was a free Holland.

It is obvious that events in these quarters, the East and the South, and Scotland in the North,

were bound to affect England, which lay between ; so in the reign of the great Elizabeth a popular form of strict Calvinism became more and more prevalent. The acute danger of recatholization in the reign of Charles I. let loose the catastrophe, and the uncompromising way in which the episcopal state church was used as an instrument of monarchical absolutism made the ecclesiastical and political opposition completely coincide. But amid the terrible convulsions caused by those years of revolution, in which, after the great peace had been made on the Continent, the king was condemned as guilty of high treason against the freedom of England and led to the scaffold—amid these convulsions there sprang from the soul of the English people, from a religious and political revolutionary Calvinism, a new development. The old reformed Calvinism which had hitherto prevailed everywhere, which had been introduced into England from Scotland and was here at first successful, was Presbyterianism ; that is to say, aristocratic republicanism which always acknowledged official authorities, rested upon historical and objective facts, scripture and the Calvinistic tradition in the creeds. Presbyterianism bore upon the whole of life, the nation and its sanctification, and was therefore always addressed to the authorities and the state. Now, however, a *radical church democracy*, whose small beginnings were hidden, suddenly comes forth into the light of day and becomes overpowering in its strength ; disregarding all historical authorities and higher courts, it listens only to the voice of God within it, but cares for individuals and the salvation of their souls, so that the Church can only be defined

as the community of the faithful, this being found "wherever two or three are gathered together in His Name." It is *Independentism* in so far as it preserves complete independence, by opposing any territorial and national church, any synod, and any church government; it is Congregationalism in so far as it separates the Church into atoms, resolving it into distinct small autonomous communities and conventicles of real believers.

The new development is to be explained partly by Calvinism itself: by the principle of the community, found side by side and in agreement with the principle of office and like it derived from Scripture; by the dogma of predestination, which makes the individual stand upon his own feet and directs him to find proof of the certainty of his salvation in his own experiences, in the voice of the Spirit, the inner light; by the influences exercised even upon Calvin by the law of Nature—partly by the peculiar character of England, where ideas of popular freedom had long been at work. Here, again, religious and political ideals completely coincided: church radicalism produced a passionate political party and succeeded in taking the lead in England until finally Cromwell, its head and hero, stood as Lord Protector at the head of the young Republic. At this time England's greatness on the seas was established, and within the kingdom itself modern England was now born. But the new ideas were marshalled under the flag of religion: when Cromwell opened the first session of the first parliament he proclaimed that he felt that some change was approaching, that they stood on the threshold, and therefore it



behoved them to lift up their heads and strengthen themselves in the Lord. Many believed that the end of all things had come, so strong was the feeling that a turning-point had been reached. A wave of enthusiasm swept over the nation and seemed to intoxicate it. It was as if a spring had burst in the depths, flooding the whole land with its water. What was the message of the voice in the depths? One of these Englishmen tells us when he says that religion is not a name, but a thing, not a form and idea, but something divine, the spiritual force in the soul of a man by which he believes and is bound to God in righteousness and holiness; this means, as we would now say, that it is based upon direct experience, and consists in a direct moral relationship between God and ourselves. If this be so, if the truth and power of religion have their roots in this spiritual relationship between God and the soul, there is here no human power of compulsion. Such was the decision of the English Parliament; if the whole of life is, as it were, a spiritual "Pilgrim's Progress" to "the Saints' Everlasting Rest," every individual must be left to his own conscience, and every form of belief be tolerated which does not conflict with the objects of the state—as Jesuit Catholicism does, being by its very nature hostile to the state. The rule is toleration of all except those who are intolerant on principle.

We cannot, without feeling deeply moved, steep ourselves in the history of these years which reached their climax in 1653, when "the parliament of saints" met. As happened in Germany in the year 1520–21, for this one moment all the currents in England

flowed together in such a way as to bring something new and uncommon to pass ; but as in Germany, this period in which, so to say, there was no history, in which enthusiasm, casting away all tradition as if it were mere ballast and leaping over all stages of development, set up an ideal form, there followed a period in which men were divided, a period of reaction and finally of compromise. Milton, the poet of the Revolution, now blind, felt constrained to sing of a "Paradise Lost"; the community of Quakers, who were the special product of that period of extreme subjectivism, were obliged to stifle their spirit of prophecy and to become a society of silent friends ; many even of the old enthusiasts and radicals found that Calvinism harmonized well with an episcopal state church ; nevertheless, the "glorious revolution" of William of Orange in 1688 brought political freedom, and by the Act of Toleration made the religious right a fundamental one. The dissenting churches of the Presbyterians and Congregationalists, the Quakers and Baptists, with certain limitations, were legally recognized as *free churches by the side of the state church*. Its connection with the state, however, became looser at the same time ; and its division into a High and Low Church party is a reminder of the period of revolution even to our own days.

And what the dissenters in Old-England did not completely attain, was gained in a better form in new England in the North American colonies. On this virgin soil, where there was no tradition to be overcome, and people did not jostle one another, there was free scope for the "holy experiment" in every form ; here particularly Congregationalism was to

enjoy a great future. Thus in addition to the most rigid form of Catholicism, that spread by the mission of the Jesuits, the freest forms of Protestantism were introduced into the new world.

Meanwhile, in the home country the cause of subjectivism had made great progress: people might reach it not only through the Reformation, but also through *humanism*. The *enlightenment*, which first became more widely prevalent in English *Deism*, is unmistakably connected with the Renaissance, during which men had ventured for the first time to examine the world without in all its variety and beauty and the rich world within the soul without using scholastic schemes and formulas. These latter were in their way clear enough: the problem was to bring order into the newly discovered, chaotic, and ever-widening kingdom of forces and phenomena, to permeate it with the human reason which was explained to be autonomous, and to come to terms with the traditional view. The problem could not be solved by the peoples of Southern Europe, for amongst these the Counter-reformation had trodden down all efforts, burned Giordano Bruno, compelled Galileo to recant, and hunted the Socinians and Antitrinitarians through Switzerland to Poland and Hungary. While, however, the Renaissance retired to the North, to seek light in the first place in the "Enlightenment," the intellect of the North being colder and keener, it allied itself with the Protestant spirit, gained in moral earnestness and discipline of thought, and was changed from a revival of art into a revival of *science*. German Protestantism, which under the guidance of Melanchthon welcomed humanism, having been in

many ways straitened and weakened, was not able to bring its seed to maturity, but all the conditions were favourable for this on the soil of Calvinism, when it had come through its struggle for freedom.

In Holland, the French Catholic Descartes and the Spanish Jew Spinoza found liberty to grapple with the greatest problems of thought as from a *tabula rasa*; not that they were irreligious, but they completely abandoned the condition of bondage in which knowledge was previously placed in relation to theology. In England, Bacon of Verulam († 1626), holding highest office in the state, taking up an attitude of independence as regards all the earlier results of inquiry, founded a completely new method for thought, which was purely inductive, and represented the mechanical procedure of natural science.

The real characteristics of the period can be discerned even in these beginnings. In the first place, reason is supreme. Descartes claimed that the fact that we think is the final proof of our existence and so of a real being in general; thought is the foundation datum. In the second place, the break with the whole of tradition, which is thus intelligible and inevitable, requires in every case that the individual of the present be taken as a starting-point, and therefore now promotes an entirely abstract doctrinaire subjectivism. But, in the third place, at the root of the determination to advance from this point to a real knowledge was the optimistic feeling of certainty that the natural man, unfettered, unburdened by tradition, contained in himself, so to say, the normal truth of reason, by which he is able to master the past and the present, Nature and society. In the fourth

place, the method of natural science showed the value of the scientific method in general, even as applied to the examination of history and the experiences of the soul. Natural science is the fundamental science; the rule over Nature, obtained by the knowledge taught by obedience to Nature, leads, even in its technical application, to an improvement of the whole of life, to an increase and diffusion of the benefits of life. Knowledge in this sense is power, progress, greater satisfaction. "Culture" became a goddess, and many people even down to the present time have continued to treat it as such.

This is the way in which the matter developed, particularly in England, the practical country which ruled the seas. And now and for the first time in a wider sense people undertook to adjust the traditional shape of the Christian religion even in its Protestant and Calvinistic form. Much as in general the religious interest had declined, the period of Revolution had left a tremor in men's minds. The dissenters' victorious struggle for freedom of conscience had helped to bring the liberal era, which began with the freedom of the press in the year 1693, and lasted, under Whig parliaments, down to the second half of the eighteenth century. But even closer links with the Revolution period may be discovered; this is shown in a striking way, for instance, by the inner history of the Quakers and by a comparison of George Fox with William Penn. The religious radical subjectivism which regarded everyone as autonomous and made him rely upon himself, in other words, on the voice of God within him, had disposed of church and tradition,

and seriously shaken the respect for Scripture and Sacrament. When hope had failed, enthusiasm evaporated and prophecy ceased, all that was left to give inward light was the natural worship of God and the voice of the conscience. There were, however, the innate ideas of religion and morality to which even the "Enlightenment" testified, when it entered into conflict with Christianity, and at which people arrived when in particular the principles of the newly reinforced law of Nature—whose chief champion, Hugo Grotius of Holland, died in the year 1645—were extended from political to the religious and ecclesiastical sphere.

Surely the teaching that at the root of all forms of divine worship there are a number of common ideas was really the teaching to be derived from this terrible period of religious disputes, from the existence of different confessions side by side—a teaching confirmed and extended by an insight into the many religions of a widening world! When the whole history of Christianity was reviewed it was discovered that Jesus the Founder taught natural religion in all its purity, but that so much error priestcraft, and distortion had been added that any claim to absolute and exclusive truth must be regarded as presumptuous. People could not try to prove the supernatural origin of Church and Scripture by means of miracles; as the result of the new conception of the world arising out of the astronomy of Copernicus and Kepler, which completely removed man and his earth from the centre of the universe, and of the knowledge of the laws of Nature, which at the same time was leading Newton from one

discovery to another, the argument from miracles fell to the ground.

Thus the revelation of a world beyond was exchanged for a process in the inner world; the concrete Christian religion of redemption gave place to deism or a colourless belief in God, the import of which was similar everywhere and was found to be a morality culminating in humanitarianism and toleration—moral discipline, “virtue,” could not be abandoned on the soil of Calvinistic Protestantism. The old reformed orthodoxy with its legality was exchanged for an intellectualism and moralism which were of much older date, were unquestionably rooted in Stoicism, and the final result of which was that a “natural theology,” that is to say, the Græco-Roman popular philosophy, was made to serve as the great substructure of the Christian conception of the world. When in London in the year 1717 the Freemasons’ Lodges of the Middle Age were converted into an “Order of Freemasons,” the ideal being that men should become humanitarians and citizens of the world, we have a proof that the spirit of enlightenment had passed beyond the circles of scholars. If we add that the English state church also, again in more secure possession of its power and not dependent for its existence on the belief of its members, had now opened its doors widely to freer views and had given free play to Arminian as well as Socinian influences, and that if people defended miracles and revelation, they only did so on the grounds of reason (rational supernaturalism), it will be realized what firm hold a generally rationalistic way of thinking had taken of England.

The whole age was influenced by a wide stream of popular literature issuing from England. Germany in particular came under its influence. Here the thirty years' war had not only blighted the bloom of Lutheran and Reformed Protestantism, but had left behind a serious rent in the spiritual life of the people.

On the one hand, especially among the aristocracy, it is under the influence of the French court, with its frivolity, its absolutism, its Catholic Jesuit leanings. The reign of the *roi soleil*, Louis XIV., who ruled his church as a Catholic, revived Gallianism and yet nursed Jesuitism, fostered the classical period of literature and yet stifled all freedom of spirit, suppressed the church of the Huguenots and the last internal movement of Catholic reform which was Augustinian in character (the Jansenist movement), gave free rein to his love of power and yet earned the reputation of being the most Christian king—this brilliant reign exercised an almost irresistible spell upon the princes of Germany. At the end of the seventeenth century the successor of Maurice of Saxony succumbed to him, the Lutheran leader of the *corpus evangelicum* in the Reichstag, the Elector Augustus the Strong, who absolutely wallowed in immorality. His conversion was the price paid for the crown of Roman Catholic Poland. But after the Northern war, the new Greek Catholic state of Peter the Great reared itself at the back of Poland. In Saxony, French influence was seconded by Austrian. The Habsburg wearer of the royal crown, Leopold, completed in his lands the work of the Counter-reformation, at the same time



breaking Hungary's independence and Protestantism, and seeking by means of conversions to make further breaches in German Protestantism.

Embarrassed and threatened by the classes on which it was most dependent, Protestantism needed the support of pure doctrine more than ever. It was now that Lutheran *orthodoxy* first became that caricature of evangelical Christianity of which the Wittenberg professor Abraham Calovius, a mathematician in religion and a true grand inquisitor, as Tholuck says, was the truest exponent. In view of this form of Lutheranism, one is easily tempted to be unjust and to ignore the great achievements of orthodoxy. During the first generations after the collapse of the old forms of Church and faith, it proclaimed untiringly the new biblical ideas even in the dull ears of peasants, and prepared them to accept the new forms of divine worship, thereby creating a new church people with a definite body of evangelical views and practices. The new school, above all, had been a product of the Reformation, and in this case the alliance with the state produced fruitful results. In the first century alone nine evangelical universities were reconstituted; in them a class of pastors were trained who in culture stood head and shoulders above the earlier shepherds of the people. The masters were Chemnitz, Hutter, Johann Gerhard, whose chief dogmatic works, true "summae" of the new theology, in the main only worked up the matter of the great confessional treatises, but explained the whole of the Lutheran system so clearly and impressively that when two hundred years later Karl Hase invoked its shadow

merely, he brought ruin upon the superficial doctrine of his own times. Afterwards the misery of the great war had brought hymnology at least to a high state of excellence, and in Paul Gerhardt it became true folk poetry.

Nevertheless, this can in no way alter the opinion that theology had now become entirely a new controversial form of scholasticism, the Church a preaching institution and school, church government a bureaucracy. Sympathy with the soul of the people who sat every Sunday in church and knew the Catechism by heart was lost, and with it in an increasing degree the power to influence the moral life. Religion was a thing apart, something performed at definite hours, particularly on Sunday. Those who were grieved at this state of things, like Johann Arndt, the profoundly spiritual author of the four books on *True Christianity*, returned to that mysticism which was prevalent before and during the Reformation.

The general and natural result of this state of things was that the serious section amongst the Lutheran people, depressed by Roman superstition and French worldliness, discontented with their own Church, felt themselves *drawn towards Calvinism*, because it offered a form of piety which was popular and in spite of its orthodoxy had a real grip on life, and this in closely related countries where a liberal force was struggling for freedom while their own country drooped in despair. The surprising successes of Calvinistic propaganda at the German courts down to the time of Gustavus Adolphus may be partly explained in this way. A path was thus cleared for

the movement of the people. Next to that of Holland, the influence of England was felt more and more; from the year 1704 its ruling family was identical with that of Hanover, and its church history was actually repeated in Germany: first Pietism, then Enlightenment (*Aufklärung*).

The excellent Suabian Johann Valentin Andreae († 1654), the reorganizer of the completely desolated church of Württemberg, found among the Reformed Genevans the starting-point and inspiration for the work of his life, which was so exceedingly full of blessing, its effects being felt down to the present time; Genevan church discipline, however, remained an ideal which he never reached. Two years later occurred the death of the leader of a school of more liberal theology in North Germany, the father of "Syncretism," Georg Calixt. If his return to the still "unanimous teaching of the first five Christian centuries," from the Apostolicon to the creed of Chalcedon, regarded as the real, because common, basis of belief, was really a relapse into Old Catholicism, a continuance of that mistake of the Reformation when it was supposed that the distortion of the gospel was first introduced with the papacy, the race of theologians trained at Helmstedt learned to look beyond the bounds of their own confession, as their master himself, for instance, did to the Reformed. From the Rhine there followed at the end of the century the *influx of Dutch-English Pietism*, characteristic of which was the system of conventicles and the strict holiness and discipline practised in them, "precision" even in mode of life. As in England, these manifestations in Holland were

a quite logical outcome of church life: Gisbert Voet, the leader of Dutch orthodoxy, the "pope of Utrecht" († 1676), not only describes but praises the conventicles, defining the "puritanism" here exercised "as the exact and perfect agreement of human actions with the law prescribed by God, accepted by *real believers* and followed with zeal," and in so doing shows the moralizing and casuistical nature of this ethic, and in the enumeration of particular works and their import reveals a tendency to asceticism and withdrawal from the world. German Pietism is certainly to be regarded as an overflow of the Calvinistic spirit into the territory of Lutheranism. The lines of development are shown in the case of Spener of Elsass himself, the fellow-countryman of Bucer, and senior pastor at Frankfort. But Lutheranism was so impoverished, and the way in which Spener carried out his "Pious Wishes" was so modest and so adapted to the new soil, that the movement started by him towards piety, towards a living religion amongst the people, had the effect of a deliverance and a popular reformation which supplemented and completed the work of Luther on the side of active life. Transferred to the Saxon centre of Lutheranism, Pietism after Spener's death (1705), starting from the newly founded University of Halle and guided by Francke, religiously fertilized the whole of Middle and North Germany, and by doing charitable works and beginning the task of foreign missions, showed its love in a broad way and opened up a whole world of duties. Rejected, however, by the leaders of Lutheranism, and brought into the warmest conflict with a dictatorial orthodoxy, it reproduced and

developed those slumbering and thinly disguised propensities which so lowered the gospel, a form of duty consisting in avoidance of the world, a subjective exercise of the feelings—the reverse side of the picture being a contempt of learning—an unhealthy practice of probing and schematizing inward experiences, an indifference to the great associations of church and confession, a fanatical cultus of communal life in select circles. In Württemberg alone, where confessional opposition was not nearly so strong, it made a sound alliance with church and theology. This German conventicle Christianity, which was obliged to grow under the control of state consistories, could not produce Independentism. But the tendency towards free churches inherent in the movement raised a monument to itself in the Community of Brethren, though many new features were here added. Its founder, Count von Zinzendorf, was godson of Spener and was educated in the Orphan Home at Halle. But the only material with which Zinzendorf could do this was that of foreign, Moravian men who had, as it were, strayed into his hands. Yet even the mistakes of Pietism, the development being regarded as a whole, were at this moment a necessity and an advance, since it was the toning down of state church confessionalism and the growth of religious individualism that first made a further development at all possible in Lutheran territories.

The revival of German evangelical Christianity, repulsed in Saxony, had found a refuge in *Brandenburg*. This state, more than any other, was in a position to minister to a reconciliation of

the Reformed and Lutheran systems. For here for the first time the prince had in the year 1613 been converted to the reformed creed, without persuading his land to follow his example: when he now entered into his Rhenish possessions, he himself already belonging to the mild kind of German Reformed churches, he ruled over strictly reformed and strictly Lutheran districts at the same time. To no one was *Union* more natural. The Great Elector was ultimately obliged to yield and could only prohibit any vituperation, but his grandson, Frederick William I., while he held out his hand over Pietism, continued in a sincerely spiritual way the work of his ancestor.

But this same Brandenburg Prussia now actually became the power around which a peculiarly German evangelical life could again rally its forces. The Great Elector, who had laid the foundations of a new political order in Germany when he defeated Sweden, delivered Prussia from its feudal relationship to Poland, and withstood the French, raised himself to the position of a protector of evangelical interests, giving asylum to French refugees as well as to Hungarian fugitives. *The guidance of German Protestantism passes from Saxony and the Palatinate to Prussia.* The first king of Prussia was, at the beginning of the century, persuaded by Leibnitz to found the Academy in Berlin and so to make a home for science. Leibnitz himself was called from Hanover to Berlin. Prussia now undertook to lead and promote Protestant intellectual life in the north of Germany. The German people themselves regained so much of their own strength, that they were able

to take up an independent and powerful position as regards the great intellectual movement of the day, when a new wave rolled over from the West and overwhelmed the old forms of church and religious life—the *Enlightenment*.

The real instrument of the Enlightenment was the periodical which at this time entered upon its mission in the world, promoting an intellectual intercourse between nations, and within each nation conveying knowledge in a condensed and easily digested form amongst all classes of society. Following a Dutch model, Thomasius, himself an early example of a journalist possessing wide culture and dealing with public life in all its phases in a bold way, in the year 1688 started the first scientific periodical written in German; in 1739 there appeared in Hanoverian Göttingen, at the seat of that recently founded university which bears the name of a king of England, that scientific organ—still the most prominent—*Die Göttingischen Gelehrten Anzeigen*. In addition to these there were the literary papers modelled in form and spirit on the English moral weeklies, which for twenty years made German citizens familiar with the ideas of English popular philosophy and moral religion. A class of polite literature starts and gains a wider and wider circulation; it is almost entirely modelled on English patterns, and includes the novel of manners, the poetry of nature, the æsthetic treatise, the moral story and fable. Gellert († 1769), in whom Frederick the Great put all his hope for a German culture, which he thought fell so far short of the genius of a Voltaire, has made everyone familiar with this style

of literature. The truly disintegrating spirit of that Frenchman, also a product of English deism in so far as Voltaire had borrowed his main ideas from England, became equally active from the middle of the century.

Popular rationalism, which consisted more in a general practical tendency towards rational knowledge and morals, these being regarded as the sum and substance of life, is now reinforced in Germany by a *speculative rationalism* amongst the students of scientific philosophy. While the attention of Englishmen turned immediately from the two substances of Descartes to Nature, and from the two modi of Spinoza to Extension and so to empirical natural science, the German Leibnitz could only recognize being in mind and thought, and so gave all his attention to sciences of the mind. Since, however, he was further convinced that the petty mind of man can form clear and adequate conceptions of the great mind of God and of the human mind itself, provided that it works in a logically correct way, his whole philosophy became a rational idealism showing a grand religiously grounded belief in the good world-reason which harmoniously guides everything. When Christian Wolff added the Stoic and practical elements of popular rationalism and made even the masses acquainted with the new ideas, this new German Platonism was able to introduce an eclectic religious philosophy of an idealistic character which, like that of the age of the Roman empire, seemed adapted to become the general religion of the noble and cultured minds in all countries and all popular



religions and confessions, and to belong, like Leibnitz himself, to all nations.

In this blended form the "Enlightenment" could not help becoming dangerous to Christianity. While in England a philosophy based one-sidedly on the methods of natural science came, as in the case of Locke even, to an undecided state of suspense as regards the Church, for which it was unable to find a substitute, in Germany a general attack on the Church followed. Lessing, in whom the scientific and popular tendencies were united, son of a Saxon Lutheran pastor and ultimately librarian at the Wolfenbüttel Library founded by Leibnitz, an artist and thinker at the same time, wrested German culture from the traditional form of religion and the domination of Christian theology, and set up a new ideal openly based upon reason and morality, an ideal in which ancient pagan culture took a leading place by the side of a rationalized Christianity.

It was now that a period of storm and stress started, and a second classical period of German poetry arose on Protestant soil, an intellectual spring-time reminding us of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Parallel to the great period of Wittenberg we have the great period of Weimar; parallel to Frederick the Wise, the defender of Luther, we have the scion of the same princely family, Charles Augustus, the patron of Goethe. An astonishing number of great men came on the scene in the 'eighties and 'nineties, and showered great and noble thoughts upon the German people—but remarkably little was said about Christianity. If theology had previously reigned supreme over all branches of knowledge and

the whole of thought, the emancipation of thought from its thralldom now seemed to indicate the end of Christianity. In the 'thirties the Freemasons' Lodges were started in Hamburg, Leipzig, and Berlin. From the latter place now issued a peculiar flood of popular or vulgar enlightenment and spread among the people, as an instance of which we need only recall the *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek* and the names Nicolai and Moses Mendelssohn. An enthusiastic desire of clear understanding is felt throughout the world.

Ultimately *the Church* was not able to remain unaffected by this development—neither the church people, nor the theologians, nor the pastors, nor the church authorities. Like Puritanism in England, Pietism in Germany had directly paved the way for the Enlightenment. By thrusting aside objective and historical values, by practising a subjective Christianity of feeling, by laying emphasis on an active principle of love, it helped many people to pass to an æsthetic and ethical Christianity of general toleration and humanitarianism. Not a few representatives of the new movement were drawn from the ranks of devout people, and its connection with these is confirmed by the fact that a sentimental and religious feeling forms a current running side by side with and beneath Rationalism, and gives it a mild and kindly tone. Goethe was not the only instance in which the pietistic “confessions of a beautiful soul” continued to echo from youth far into life. It is commonly and justly pointed out that Solomon Semler, the father of theological criticism († 1791), and his career indicate that even in professional theology Pietism directly introduced people to

Rationalism. But here, relatively speaking, it penetrated latest; and it was due to the influence of Kant, who in the year 1793 connectedly described "religion within the limits of the pure reason," in other words, as moral sentiment, that Teller, Wegscheider, and others were led to make a systematic restatement of rationalistic theology. The intellectual atmosphere surrounding the clergy and their congregations, and now also breathed by theological professors, influenced more and more the language of the pulpits.

Now began that ill-famed preaching of a Christianity which dispensed with Christ, but discussed all kinds of generally useful facts, which above all made Rationalism a name for heresy, and in which the great weakness of this style of thinking, as applied to the objects of religion, may certainly be as drastically illustrated as that of pietism in the younger Francke and that of orthodoxy in Abraham Calovius. But we must not only admit, with Tholuck, that such style of thought was necessary as a transition, because the power of scholasticism in theology and of superstition in devotion could be overcome only by this declaration of independence by the individual judgment, but also that, measured by the gospel, it contained certain excellent elements which could never again be lost sight of. Rationalism, it is true, dragged heaven down to earth, but by doing so it made Christianity again a simple and tangible thing and brought it back to the natural and everyday duties of our life; Christianity in this form ceased to be a school, a mysterious system and a number of special ceremonies, understood the personality of the individual in relation to its concrete reality, showed him

the moral duties of life, explained his calling in the family and state as an obligation towards God, and thus once more inseparably united religion and morals. This conception of Christianity, regarded as a teaching of virtue, decidedly poor as it was, was the religion of the dutiful and honourable Prussian officials as well as of the king himself, who realized that he was the first servant of the state.

The movement of enlightenment, when it disintegrated all churches and confessions and preached toleration to everyone, could not have spread so widely, had not the *state* itself, which had been entrusted with the government of the Church, changed equally in its *relations to the Church*. When in the seventeenth century the inward bond uniting the German courts with the church and theology of the Reformation had already snapped, and the patriarchal attitude, still adopted by the duke "Praying Ernest" of Gotha († 1675), had in the period of absolutism given place to a coolly indifferent, purely territorial one, the application of the law of Nature, as completed by Thomasius in particular, produced in Germany also the theory of the Church regarded as a free association. If, on the one hand, this of necessity favoured the independence of the Church, the Church being recognized as a peculiar organism with a special inward life, yet on the other hand it made the Church even more completely subject to the state, which, now that it had lost its religious meaning, could bring its secular, juristic, and police character to bear in a perfectly pure form upon the Church corporation. Thus there soon arose a Prussian king whose absolutism made him the unfettered master

even of his state church, and whose enlightenment, to use his own words, allowed every man to save his soul after his own fashion.

“Old Fritz” has his place in church history not solely on this account. His political greatness changed the position of German Protestantism. It was not merely that England’s influence upon German development now definitely gave place to the direct influence of Prussia, but within the German empire Protestant North German Prussia dislodged Catholic Austria. Even in the estimation of the people! When after a long spell of misery people could again take pride in the deeds of a German hero, when even outside of Prussia people’s sympathies had become “Fritzian,” they paid homage to the genius of a prince who was stamped as a Protestant, and German national feeling was awakened by the blows struck at Catholic powers through the alliance with the spirit of Protestantism. And a fact of still greater importance! The master of the art of war who continued to be victorious over Russians, French, and Austrians, made for his state, and so for *German Protestantism*, a position of *a great power* in the Concert of Europe. All this paved the way for the most important decisions of the nineteenth century.

No wonder that this keen Protestant spirit of the age of Frederick pervaded even the Catholic world. It conquered its principal seats, Vienna, Paris, Rome, and laid hands on the papacy itself, which had for some time been stirred by liberal moods. Following the example of Portugal, which had become infected with political liberalism, Tridentine Catholicism shook off its chief support, the Company of Jesus, in

Spain and France, and finally in its principal stronghold. In 1773 Clement XIV. Ganganelli took an unusual course; by the bull "Dominus ac redemptor noster" he undertook to dissolve the society as a source of disquiet among the peoples; the Catholic states of the German empire followed. The fugitive Fathers found admittance in Russia and the state where even the Jesuit could save his soul after his own fashion. Heresy and enlightenment sheltered all that remained. Joseph's ten years of doctrinaire liberalism passed over Austria; in Bavaria a Catholic Society of the Friends of Light pursued its course; within the empire in 1786 the archbishops, with a view to setting up a German National Church, made a compact at Ems expressly appealing to the old law of the constitution made at Constance in 1415. A feeling passed over the world that the days of Catholicism were numbered. Frederick the Great told Voltaire that he thought he (Voltaire) would live to see the end of it. And as a matter of fact, the Protestant spirit of enlightenment here gradually and peacefully overcame the Catholic in its whole extent. The expulsion of the Salzburgers in the 'thirties of the eighteenth century was the last wave of the Counter-reformation. The exclusive claim made by the hierarchical Church, that people could find life and happiness only under the crosier, is overcome by the idea that humanity and toleration must be shown towards those who differ from us, and gives way before the authority of the state; the negative morality of monasticism retreats before the Protestant ideal of active work, the practice of virtue in one's daily calling, in the service of the state. We

can never tell where this whole development might have led, at least within the empire, if this concentration of Protestant enlightenment at one point in Europe, really a focus, had not brought catastrophe at the end of the century. Also in Austria, Italy, the Pyrenean peninsula, liberal reforms, often headlong, had introduced a great amount of dissatisfaction, such as to make reactions almost inevitable, but the absolute, deep-rooted, and general change in views and circumstances is explained only by that terrible event the *French Revolution*, which with its resultant movements shook the European world for twenty-five years and set up a placard of warning the like of which has not been seen.

On this placard the Catholic people read thus : Beware of a subjective Protestantism which is hostile to authority, for it has caused the Revolution. In the Syllabus of 1864 this was put into official language, and times without number it has been repeated by the Ultramontanes. The very opposite was the truth, for on the placard was written : Beware of the Catholicism of the Jesuits, for it is Jesuitism which in alliance with absolutism has first broken the conscience of a highly gifted nation when it was struggling to attain freer forms of religion ; secondly, has kept it in a terrible condition of mediæval social misery, and by all this has deprived it of its inward strength, to work out those ideas of a new age which powerfully urged men on, and to reform themselves outwardly and inwardly. The light of knowledge, which Frederick the Great showed to his people, taught them to bear, and carried in front of them to illuminate their lives and duties, acted in that land

like a firebrand. The enlightenment introduced from England in the eighteenth century here brought about, not a philosophical idealism and home-spun religion of a moral kind, but the crass materialism of Diderot, Holbach, Lamettrie, Helvetius, the hatred and contempt for religion of Voltaire, the political radicalism of Rousseau. But all the theories and witty criticisms discussed in the literary salons of Paris, with all their finery and frivolity, would not have created the Revolution if they had not been reinforced by the voracious hunger of a people depraved and brutalized by the *ancien régime*. The general outcry for freedom, for the complete emancipation of the individual, for an equal share in the government and enjoyment of life among a nation of brothers—the French tricolor of *liberté, égalité, fraternité*—brought, together with absolute religious freedom, regarded as a common human right, the hour of freedom even to the Protestant remnant, the Church of the Huguenots, the noble “Church of the Wilderness” which had been revived by means of extraordinary sacrifices—though it was really but a vanishing remnant. The Church was the Catholic Church, so that the end could be nothing less than a radical overthrow. The constituent assembly of the year 1789–90 even gave it a violent blow, a blow which thrust aside a development of a thousand years and effected what was perhaps planned by Henry V. in the year 1111: the complete removal of clerical possessions, the restriction of the clergy to the clerical office, though not, as in the reign of Henry V., for the purpose of making Rome mistress in spiritual matters, but in



order completely to adapt the clergy to the new form of constitution. Thirty-three bishops fell by a stroke of the pen; the *curés* became state clergy with state allowances. In Henry's time the German bishops (p. 200) revolted; now many priests refused to take the oath of allegiance to this new form of constitution; the king supported his priests, and in his distress invited outside help.

The king thus became guilty of high treason, and when he was executed, the Church fell at the same time, and with the Catholic Church, since people recognized no other, Christianity itself. Once more, as at the beginning of this period, there were a few years, 1792-93, in which men revelled in the thought of freedom, in which they were overcome by a kind of mental intoxication. In the English Revolution as well the old order, both in church and state, had been overthrown, and there arose a radical process of levelling; there, as well as here, a king had been led to the scaffold. But contrast Cromwell the regicide in the one country with Robespierre the regicide in the other, the parliament of saints with the Committee of public safety! In the one country the power of an unfettered freedom was due to the deepest devotion to God; in the other God Himself was brought to the scaffold, and Christ crucified anew. The world's history is no longer reckoned from Christ's birth, but from this discovery of the individual sovereign Ego; Reason, the goddess of the age, makes her entry into Notre-Dame. Perhaps the most terrible feature of this, a feature clear at once, is that in the minds of these men of France Christianity and belief in God were esteemed as

nothing. The curse was that people had not learned to understand Christianity as a mode of life, but as a theory amongst other theories, if superior to others. It is well known that in the year following, immortality and the existence of God were formally decreed, a God therefore by the grace of the French people! A Catholic conception of religion here brings its own punishment. The French Revolution at the end of this historical section marks the victorious progress of Protestant subjectivism, but it is a misunderstood Protestant subjectivism grown on the soil of a Catholic form of spiritual life. The massacre of St Bartholomew's day, the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and the Dragonnades, were divinely avenged in the frenzy of those years.

## XVI

### RELIGIOUS AND ECCLESIASTICAL RE- GENERATION, AND THE STRUGGLE OF OPPOSING TENDENCIES IN RECENT TIMES

THE configuration of a group of mountains may look intelligible at a distance, but the arrangement of the masses is more and more puzzling as one gets nearer to them. It is the same with the period with which we now have to deal; the nearer we stand to it the more difficult it is to discover its main lines. Yet the fact that the lines appear to intersect one another is not solely the result of being nearer to them. There was bound to be a reaction against the rule of subjectivism, exhibiting the actual connections of the subject with the historical and social conditions. Since this growing movement favoured the revival of old forms, the exponents of the Enlightenment felt their most important achievements to be threatened, and a sharp conflict was bound to arise and drive both parties to take up radical positions and make radical demands. The farther we advance in the nineteenth century, the more confused does the picture become until, coming immediately near to our own time, the antitheses seem to soften—at least

in the opinion of the present writer. On the other hand, the increasing solidarity and intellectual unity of the people of Europe simplifies the development in so far as the movements spread more uniformly over the historic area, and so can take shape in different lands at the same time. By devoting our attention mainly to Germany and allowing the development there to guide us in marking off the periods, we can picture the progress of the *whole movement*, especially as German Protestantism has taken the lead in spiritual matters.

The most recent history of the Church—generally identified with that of the nineteenth century—usually starts with the supposition that the period of the Revolution and the severe chastening process which resulted from it under the hand of Napoleon cured the European world of its rationalistic arrogance and led to a revival of religion. As far as England was concerned, this is absolutely untrue, and as regards Germany the statement needs to be qualified.

In *England*, where the enlightenment had not infected the Church anything like so seriously, its subjectivism had been quietly and inwardly vanquished at a much earlier date by scepticism and Methodism—in other words, by a deeper knowledge and an awakening of a more heartfelt piety. As the “inquiries” into the human understanding advanced from those of Locke to those of Hume († 1776), the pleasing conviction that the instrument of our thought could produce such normative truths of reason as, let us say, a universally valid doctrine of God and morality, was shattered. A positive and at the same time popular supplement to this scepticism

was provided in the *Methodism* of Whitefield († 1771) and Wesley († 1791), who based *their* subjectivism, as the Pietists did, even if in a mechanical way, upon the old experiences of sin and grace, and so, like the followers of the Enlightenment, clipped tradition, attaching all importance to simple practical questions and the moral "ideal of perfection," and finally within the state church addressed themselves to the whole people, thereby doing justice to the requirements of a new age. If this resulted, just as its predecessors on reformed soil did, in a free Church, this Church, of which in the present day there are twenty-eight million adherents in the world, supplies us with a proof that Anglo-Saxon Protestantism may certainly produce powerful forces of religious revival in its own fold, forces operating with entire freedom, and from the midst of life in its most modern form. How deeply all the churches of England have been affected by this revival is shown by the founding about the year 1800 of the great Missionary and Bible Societies.

In *Germany*, too, Protestantism has corrected and rejuvenated itself—in general, it is true, not till the nineteenth century. But it is unjust to the preceding period to speak of a revival if we would suggest by this that the previous generations were quite dead in a religious sense, and that new life was merely instilled by the national calamities and the wars of freedom.

In the first place, *Pictism* was not dead. In the South of Germany at least its forces had remained alive. In 1780 Urlsberger, the senior pastor of Ulm, founded the Society of Christianity, a far-

reaching union of wide- and warm-hearted Christians ; at the beginning of the century this and the example of the English foundations led to the foundation of the great Basel organizations for foreign missions. Nor indeed was Pestalozzi, king amongst educators, a man in whom rationalism was softened by a tender-hearted pietistic leaning, a product merely of the trials under Napoleon : the book of *Lienhard und Gertrud* appeared in the year 1785. Even in Zinzendorf there was a peculiar mixture of pietism and enlightenment, and since his Community of Brethren, when Spangenberg had purged it of its eccentricities, looked beyond the conventicles to the quite general purpose of a reawakening and revival amongst the people and throughout the world, it was already moving towards the social ideas of the future.

As regards the rationalism of the north of Germany, too, which we have already described, our last section has already shown that it was not only an "apostacy," but contained positive forces having power to work out further results. But our sketch of the period was incomplete, as we meant it to be. The German Enlightenment contained impulses of its own, and so soon as they prevailed, the *Enlightenment itself was overcome* amongst educated people. We have decisive proofs of this even before the period of Napoleon.

It is not my intention to lay great stress on the fact that, as in England, there arose in the *department of theology*, by the side of pure rationalism and in opposition to it, a rational supernaturalism, for, measured by the gospel conception of faith, both are on the same level, whether I now regard

the Christian religion as a reasonable and natural truth, and this as the real revelation, its acceptance being the characteristic of a Christian, or whether I define it as a supernatural revelation, but prove and explain it reasonably and declare this sum of doctrines to be Christianity. In this department of knowledge, theology, after the general attack made by the Enlightenment, a radical reconstruction was necessary. It had arrived at a condition different from all earlier stages of development, in so far as it was face to face not only with certain heresies, or even a general distortion of the gospel, as we find it in Romanism, but in many cases with a denial of all the foundations. It cannot be stated too emphatically that the new age compelled the Church for the first time to take once more a position which it had abandoned since the time of Theodosius, and of which, therefore, the Confessions of the Reformation period could take no account. Down to this time it was obvious that outwardly at least people lived as Christians in a Christian society: henceforth it was necessary to fight not only against superstitious people, but also against unbelievers. There arose a society which, though it had passed through Christianity and was connected with it in a thousand ways, came into direct intellectual sympathy with the ancient world, and actually adopted and adapted that Platonic and Aristotelian, Stoic and Epicurean paganism against which in the first centuries the Church had been obliged to struggle for its very existence. Thus apologetics and the questions of primary truths again became prominent; thus it became inevitable that in those days a scientific foundation for Christ-

ianity could only be gained if the primary truths were guaranteed in a new way, and for this in particular it was necessary to overthrow the temper of the Enlightenment.

*Classical German philosophy* and classical German poetry did this service. In the decade at the end of which the catastrophe swept over France Immanuel Kant wrote his most important works—in 1781 the *Critique of Pure Reason*, and in 1788 the *Critique of Practical Reason*; during the height of the French Revolution in 1794 Fichte compiled his grandiose system of science. In Kant the two streams of philosophy which started upon Protestant soil unite, German idealism or rationalism in the philosophic sense with English empiricism and scepticism. Following the Englishmen, and instituting critical inquiries into the organ of our thought and the facts of our consciousness, he became convinced that all the theoretical results of thought, and so all the facts of the exact sciences, are based upon the experiences of the senses, whereas the ideas of God, freedom, and immortality, which are present in us apart from this sense experience, are to be described merely as practical requirements. In this way he freed the knowledge of the world from the domination of “faith” regarded as a higher knowledge of the world. On the other hand, by following the Germans and explaining *these* same postulates, which are inherent in us but admit of no further proofs, not indeed as illusions, but as real because immediate certainties, and by showing rather that empirical knowledge is only a reflection of a world in itself unknowable, conveyed to our consciousness by the



fallible senses, and ordered by the laws peculiar to our consciousness, he showed that the ethical and religious spirit was independent of and even prior to Nature. This teaching made so powerful an impression that Fichte, who regarded himself as the metaphysical completer of the criticism of Kant, raised this strong ego which gives the moral law to the rank of the absolute Ego, to the God-ego, which produced itself and the non-ego, the world of appearance, in order to have in them the material of its own ethical law-giving and development. This certainly seems to be the height of subjectivism, but at the very moment when in France people were giving themselves up to orgies of unbridled immorality, it declared that the ethical spirit was sovereign over the flesh.

If, however, the independence and supremacy of the spirit was settled, a more living, richer and more liberal meaning could be instilled into the form than the rigid formulæ of the philosophers permitted. This service was rendered by classical German poetry, partly even through the influence of Kant, as Schiller in particular shows. It is a fact of history, and one which presses with a dead weight upon the mind of every young devout person, that those favourite writers of ours with whom our people and we ourselves become familiar from childhood, remain quite aloof at least from the Church and often from historical Christianity. But we have learned to look more deeply at things. In place of the ideal of the Enlightenment our poets have put the *cult of genius*. Lavater once defined genius as the unlearned, unborrowed, unlearnable, unborrowable,

inwardly peculiar, inimitable, divine, inspired. The life of their own soul with all its storm and stress taught people to go back from the activities of the understanding and the will to the secrets of the heart, to the creative first cause, the nature of the soul and its simple primitive emotions and vibrations. How could people help finding religion in these depths of the soul? Even Rousseau found it in them. The capacity to understand immediate religious experience, prophecy, and therefore religious inspiration, awakened generally; Goethe himself recognized a religious genius even in Lavater, and was for a long time bewitched by this impression. In addition to Lavater there were others, who were both poets and "prophets" at the same time: Jung-Stilling, Hamann in particular, the "Magus of the North," Matthias Claudius, Jacobi, smaller lights by the side of the great lights of Weimar, and yet people possessing a new, direct, powerful and original religion of a Christian type.

Of the great men of Weimar, however, there was one who carries us a step further, Herder; under the influence of that spirit of Goethe, which sought to measure all reality, but also of his calling as a Christian preacher which led him on the path of a development running through the whole history of humanity, he devoted himself to the wide field of *historical knowledge*, sought for genius, the original and creative element and therefore the genuine element in great individuals, as well as in the unconscious process in the soul of the people, and gathered up his discoveries into a history of the development of the human mind. In 1778 appeared the *Voices*

of the Peoples, and from 1784 his *Ideas for a Philosophy of the History of Mankind*. In this spiritual history he came to the conclusion that in the domain of religion the most noteworthy phenomenon was Christianity's religion of humanity, that the greatest creative genius was Christ the Son of man, that the highest and noblest "people's book," a book equally pervaded by poetry and wisdom, was the Bible, the "voice of the people" of Israel, and yet the book of humanity, because it was the voice and word of God to Israel. Humanity and Christianity here formed a new alliance under the banner of history.

In many respects the condition of things was again just as it was on the eve of the Reformation: there also the soil had been prepared and the way opened by a critical philosophy—we mean Nominalism; by new forms of art and science which put in the vacant space a meaning derived from the consciousness of an inspired Ego and yet entered into all real facts—we mean the Renaissance and humanism; by a new psychological study of the immediate religious life of the soul—we mean German mysticism, which also created a language of its own. Friedrich *Schleiermacher* was not a second Luther, but, having been deeply affected by the preparatory forces implied in the names of Kant, Goethe, Herder, and Zinzendorf, he was able to become the *Reformer of German Protestantism*, at least in the sphere of culture. In 1799, when he was thirty years old, he addressed his "Discourses on Religion to the Cultured Persons amongst its Despisers." Precisely because they were obviously so nearly related to the

most refined form of unbelief, æsthetic idealism, were infected with the spirit of Goethe, and yet with great feeling claimed for religion a "province of its own" in the life of the human soul in direct self-consciousness, and showed that in this province again the definite religion of despised Christianity was mistress, they in fact made such an impression on many people that new land seemed to have been discovered. But he found the sublime feature of Christianity to consist in the idea of redemption, and the sublimity of Christ, who must accordingly have been of divine as well as of human nature, to consist in His office of mediator between finite and infinite, not in the "purity of His moral teaching" (the explanation of rationalism), not in the "peculiarity of His character with all its great power and touching gentleness" (the explanation of the period of the geniuses). Thus he in principle passed beyond the "Enlightenment" in church and theology and produced a movement the vibrations of which were to be felt throughout the new century which was just dawning. Like a prophet, at the threshold of a new era he balanced the old and the new facts—a lonely man, it is true, but strong in the conviction that victory was coming: "Religion counts for nothing among almost all our companions in the present world, upon whom dawns a life of power and fulness," but it is precisely "from nothing that a new creation always proceeds." "What is not to be expected of an age which is so obviously on the border-line of two different orders of things? Once the violent crisis is past, it may even have introduced this kind of impetus; and a prophetic soul such as

the burning spirits of our time have in them, directed to the creative genius, might perhaps even at this moment fix that point which to future generations must become the centre for their communion with the Deity." Will it be a new form of culture by the side of Christianity? Or must Christianity also decay and perish? "Why should it? Its living spirit slumbers indeed often and for long periods and withdraws in a state of numbness behind the dead shelter of the letter, but again and again it awakens, whenever in the spiritual world the weather is propitious for its revival and stirs its fresh sap; thus again and again it returns and lives anew in different forms."

And the weather did become favourable, stirring the vital forces not only of the educated class, but of the whole *people*. In what we have already said we have had no idea of undervaluing the importance of the great historical acts by which God has guided mankind. The upheavals which were seen to be taking place in the neighbouring land in the 'nineties had also been at work in German Protestantism; on the one hand they had here also awakened and strengthened ideas of human rights, peace among nations, and a citizenship of the world; on the other hand they made the appeal for authority, for restriction of the democratic tendency, for protection for throne and altar, to be heard more distinctly, an appeal which found a loud reverberation at the court of Frederick William II., the originator of Wöllner's religious edict (1788). An attempt was made first to save, and afterwards to avenge, the fallen monarchy in France.

Now over Germany itself swept the overthrow of all settled conditions, provoked by the great son of the French Revolution, the Corsican parvenu, who was raised to the throne by a people in arms, and in whom subjectivism in the sense of despotic egoism found its embodiment. In Germany thrones fell like houses of cards, armies were dispersed; France extended her frontier to Hamburg, and the King of Prussia, now Frederick William III., fled to the most distant corner of his kingdom. The growing appeal for the protection of historical rights availed nothing; what did avail was *the appeal made to the people* by word and deed. This was decisive for the whole *period down to 1830*. The reconstruction of the Prussian state began at the bottom, converted bondmen into free peasants, dead-alive colonies into flourishing and self-governing communities, and the whole country into a nation in arms bound to defend hearth and home. The appeal "to my people" made in 1813 was the turning-point. When the storm was past, in Germany the important matter could not only be to establish throne and altar more securely than ever and to suppress any more liberal movement, but the great deliverers of Prussia, with Stein at their head, proceeded to guarantee the people a share in the government which it had earned with blood and sorrow. They wished to create a state which by the united labours of prince and people was not only to ensure law and order, but also to guard all the treasures of civilization—even the holy treasure of religion, the *faith* of the people. In the terrible seriousness of the situation, when the heart had

continually to be braced up for hope and sacrifice, when the most unlikely of events happened, and all the glory of the world showed itself to be perishable like the flower of the grass, to many the much-praised light of human insight seemed dull, and the staff of their own righteousness was broken. The old sincere Bible-faith in a God, to whom we are answerable, who sends us punishment, but also a time of salvation and a Saviour to redeem us and make us truly free, arose again deep down in the heart, coming, not as a gift from the ruling authorities, but as a free gift from God, not among all alike, but among many—and those the best. It was felt that this also was part of the threatened inheritance from the fathers, and to be possessed it had to be earned anew. The champions and singers of freedom had themselves laid the honour at the feet of God; progress and piety were allies. And on the other side, in face of the great liberal trend of the people, which made its own all that was best in the aims of the Revolution, it was impossible for reaction for the present to take place in the domain of the Church. It is characteristic of the next period that the liberal and conservative element, the appreciation of subjective freedom and piety and of objective authority and churchmanship, still coincide. This gives it some measure of greatness: people are still “a united nation of brothers.”

What unites them is the magic word *history*. The cult of genius was exchanged for the cult of the spirit of the people, the Enlightenment for *Romanticism*. Even in the old century Friedrich von Hardenberg, known as Novalis, wrote his *Heinrich*

*von Ofterdingen*. In 1806 Jacob Grimm began to collect the German *Fairy Tales*, and soon Brentano and Arnim made the melodies of old live again in "Des Knaben Wunderhorn." Romanticism is the awakening of the historical feeling *before* exact historical inquiry, interwoven with a feeling for Nature which to a preponderating extent turned its attention to the native land, and which, introduced by Goethe and Spinoza, and fostered by Schelling, saw God in the world, and in turn paved the way for the great period of German natural science. This made it so fantastic and full of contradictions, a wonderful flower from fairyland which falls to pieces when we attempt to analyze it, the dream which the soul of a people dreamed of its own past in the beautiful garden of our Fatherland. It is not true that man is an isolated being; in the individual the spirit of earlier generations operates unconsciously—even the religious and Christian spirit which was the power of that time when it had really once already made Germany a great nation and given it a rich life full of art and chivalry—we mean the time of the Middle Age. Thus, from the effort to arrive at views as clear and definite as possible by means of the scheme of Wolff, people ultimately attained an enthusiasm for the uncertain twilight of the cathedrals of the Middle Age.

Man, again, if we look at his present life, is only a link in a chain, a member of a people which is strong so long as it holds together: this was what people felt. But there is both a *church people* and a *religious* exercise of communion. "I can establish no Christianity without a community," Zinzendorf had



exclaimed, and Schleiermacher had reiterated the statement: "all religion is social." It was the *Church* which shed upon the world of men in the Middle Age a supraterritorial brilliance. The term *Church* again denoted something venerable, and acquired a solemn and mystical sound.

In its confessional differences disappeared. The indifference of the earlier periods still made itself felt even in *Catholicism*. The Greek Catholic Emperor of Russia, the Roman Catholic Emperor of Austria, and the Protestant King of Prussia, had carried on the holy war together, and formed a Holy Alliance. Episcopalian or Gallican views, which were liberal and friendly to the state, prevailed among the Catholic clergy. Napoleon had effected his great purpose of secularization even in Germany: in the year 1803 the evil growth of clerical principalities was extirpated from the world. In France, too, he had set the Church on its feet again, though in his concordat he revived the Gallicanism of Louis XIV. and his predecessors. Through the power of the allies the supreme lord of the Church regained his liberty and the patrimonium Petri—even the Jesuits came on the scene again—but he could not withhold his gratitude from the state. The Bavarian concordat of the year 1817, together with the constitution of 1818, meant a victory of the state and of liberal Catholicism. The spirit of a Wessenberg and a Sailer ruled in Germany; these Catholics were connected with believing Protestants by the bond of a close friendship.

In *Protestantism* itself the person of Schleiermacher († 1834) took a pre-eminent and central position. In

the new centre of German Protestant life, at the University of Berlin, amongst the founders and great men of which he was numbered from the first, he began in 1810, the first year of its existence, the *reconstruction of theology*. Those who have so far followed our account in its rapid course, will realize that the task set before Schleiermacher can only be compared with that which confronted the first Greek Fathers, and his work is parallel with that of Irenæus and Origen. From the foundations that were then laid men had advanced century by century in thought and work; in spite of the fact that the position of things had changed in principle, the Reformation still stood firmly upon the old foundations, and to a wide extent even retained the old forms of instruction and presentation. The old Protestant Churches had worked theology and philosophy, Scripture and confession, and the new Protestant and old Catholic interpretation of the gospel, into a new scholasticism and showed its ministers how to fight in the pulpit with these arms; theology evaporates in polemical dogmatics and homiletics. Pietism had indeed led people back to Scripture, but it was without the scientific impulse and lacked systematic method entirely, and what the Enlightenment, which was still in its infancy, did in the theological domain was of a historical, critical, and prevailing negative nature—the removal of the cobwebs of tradition. The eye now swept freely over the fields of history, traversed already to the origins of our religions, and pierced candidly into the depths of the present Christian consciousness. In his *Short Account of Theological Study* Schleiermacher

suggested a reorganization of Christian learning, making apologetic principia the substructure, historical theology the wide centrepiece, and a practical and technical theology the finishing-piece. Where now was that discipline, dogmatics, which had hitherto swallowed up all other parts of the science? Did it now entirely disappear? It will always be a memorable fact that dogmatics, which people thought they had fixed to all eternity, and which the spirit of the age afterwards removed altogether from the rank of sciences, in the case of the philosophical reviver of theology, reappeared in the framework of "historical theology" as a presentation of the faith-consciousness of a definite period, that period which was really only the last point in a historical process. A psychological point of view now reigns in addition to the historical. The *Doctrine of Faith according to the Principles of the Evangelical Church*, published in 1821, was Schleiermacher's great work, carrying out what Melancthon had started, the first free reconstruction of dogmatics since the great Alexandrine—more systematic than that of Origen, and drawn from the central idea of the gospel, a doctrine of salvation, not a religious philosophy, and therefore the *first really "evangelical" general presentation of the tenets of Christianity* in a scientific form; the faith-consciousness described is based on an inward experience, one of redemption, that is, mainly of sin and grace; it depends entirely upon the person of Christ and the new personality of the Christian, and the fellowship of Christians grow up out of communion with His life. We have again, without doubt, the main lines of the old simple gospel of

the apostles, in spite of many failures in the method of following them out. And to the historical and psychological points of view is added the practical: as this doctrine of salvation is drawn from the living faith of the present community, so, too, all theology has the social and practical purpose of serving the Church, and is held together by this purpose.

Just as with the Church, peace seemed to have been made here with the other sciences, in whose domain theology had regained the right of citizenship, their due place being assigned at the same time to all the others. Philosophy is now treated no longer as a servant but as a friend and sister. In addition to Schleiermacher, Hegel in Berlin proclaimed his doctrine of the self-unfolding of the absolute idea. Fichte had made idealistic philosophy assume the character of a *history* of the idea: now all that happens was filled with idea and viewed as a unity in the great and all-embracing process of the world displayed by the system of Hegel—a truly magic potion for men thirsting for unity in the spiritual life. Nature, state, and art found a sure place in this general upward movement of the mind from the finite to the infinite, and religion also, which, in the realm of ideas, followed the general process, completed itself in Christianity, just as philosophy did in the pure logic of Hegel, except that this was a higher form of religion, just as gnosis was among the Alexandrines. In this sense he proclaimed eternal peace between religion and philosophy.

The theology of Schleiermacher in point of fact lies above the confessions. There was to be peace,

too, between Reformed and Lutherans. On the 31st of October 1817, the three hundredth anniversary of the posting up of the theses, Frederick William III. announced the *reunion* which had been longed for even by his forefathers and was in conformity with "the great purposes of Christianity, the original intentions of the Reformers, and the spirit of Protestantism." In 1822 it was recommended that the liturgy drawn up by the king himself should be introduced, and in 1830 an abridged and improved form, approved by Schleiermacher, was made legally binding on the Church. The Palatinate and Baden had followed the example of Prussia. So far as the general mass of Protestant Germany was concerned, the old discord had seemingly vanished: the common "evangelical" territorial church concealed the distinction which had entirely lost its meaning for rationalism, and this still continued to prevail in most of the pulpits and schools. But also on the part of the "revivalist" section among the people a positive ministry of love and mission work had begun, which made no distinction between Reformed and Lutherans. Types of this are the Basle mission and the first rescue work undertaken on behalf of distressed children in the south and north. Here once again pietism proved its power to unite active Christians in the different evangelical sections in a ministry of love, which showed by its broad stand-points that people had come to the end of another epoch: the most instructive and interesting figure is that of Johannes Falk, who, while still united in friendship to the heroes of Weimar, being himself a poet and an ardent patriot, founded the Luther-

Home near Weimar for the sufferers during the times of Napoleon. Humanity and a popular and national sentiment are here once again included in the compass of a Christian conception of life. Under such influences at this time a greater man than Falk arose in Hamburg—we mean Wichern.

But there had long been signs that *the spirit was changing*. From the year 1817 undercurrents might be noted which tended to separate those who were bound together by distress and enthusiasm. In *the domain of the Catholic Church* the mild government of Louis XVIII. of France gave place in 1824 to the strictly legitimist rule of Charles X. The views expressed by the real theoretical creator of modern Ultramontanism, the pupil of the Jesuits, Count de Maistre, in his two books, *Concerning the Pope* and *Concerning the Gallican Church*, were now able to take root. He has thus formulated the curialistic argument in all its uncompromising nakedness: "Without the pope there can be no sovereignty, without sovereignty no unity, without unity no authority, without authority no faith," consequently without the pope no faith. We note at the same time the alliance between ecclesiastical and political reactionaries.

In the same year that the book *Concerning the Pope* appeared, in 1817, which was also the tercentenary of the Reformation in *Protestant* Germany, a great number of students celebrated the Wartburg festival, constituting themselves the general German "Burschenschaft." The liberal sentiment here displayed awakened a new fear of the Revolution. The spirit of Metternich gradually settled upon

Central Europe; fear again banished love and confidence, making people suspicious of demagoguery everywhere, and causing them to look askance at the strength of a young and aspiring Germany. On the other hand, disillusionment began to increase, as it appeared that the fruit of the struggles for freedom was being lost. Opposition made itself felt even in the domain of the Church. The framework of the state church had long ago become too narrow for the Protestant life which was again unfolding itself so richly. The "State of the Enlightenment," religiously indifferent, left the inward life on the whole unaffected. Now religion had moved the wearers of the Prussian crown. But instead of yielding to the general desire for independence by waiving his rights, and by revision of his own position, following the lines laid down by Stein in 1807, Frederick William III. wished to instil new life into the old patriarchal form, and gave offence to all who desired more freedom in the Church. While in the Palatinate and Baden, and likewise, at least in intention, in Bavaria, a synodal representation was added to the ecclesiastical government of the sovereign, even in that part of Prussia including the old synodally constituted churches, in Rhineland-Westphalia, this kind of representative constitution was not introduced until 1835. On the other hand, the king himself drew up the liturgy of 1822 from ecclesiastical regulations of the sixteenth century with an ordination oath having a political colouring, made excerpts from Luther and Melancthon, wrote on auricular confession, and made preparations for the introduction of church discipline.

The liberalism which felt itself to be imperilled by these proceedings was again at variance with itself. If one party desired independence for a continued and unrestricted development, the other wished it because it was tied to earlier stages of development. It was unavoidable that when the historical sense reawakened and the churches again linked themselves with their real past, in view of their peculiar character, their differences also should reappear. People began once more to appreciate the teaching and creed of the Fathers. In the year 1817, at that eventful tercentenary festival, Klaus Harms, living under the government of the Danish Church, in Schleswig-Holstein, a man full of unbending strength of character, renewed in ninety-five theses the struggle on behalf of the Lutheran doctrine of justification. This was at first intended as an attack upon rationalism; but the Union also, which was proclaimed on the same day, was struck, as it was meant to be, by the same blow.

In the *period from 1830-1848* the opposing tendencies, which had been slumbering, were already fully brought to light. The Revolution of July opened the period, and in France carried the democracy half-way along the road to victory. In Germany also the result was a more and more steady advance of democratic or liberal ideas, an urgent demand on the part of the people for a constitutional share in the government, which in Saxony and the electorate of Hesse brought success, but in Prussia led at first simply from one disillusionment to another. Since the period of deliverance from France a national longing was connected with the thoughts of popular freedom.



With deep dejection people saw the tree of hopes planted by Stein being continually stripped of its leaves. It was like autumn in German countries.

*Catholicism* knew in a masterly way how to exploit the situation and throw itself into the liberal and national ideas. In France Lamennais even founded a Christian socialism—"God and freedom!"; in Italy from the year 1846 the new Pope Pius IX. himself appeared at the head of liberalism and the national movement.

At the end of the 'thirties there was an unfortunate dispute in Prussia regarding the question of mixed marriages, which, starting in Cologne, led to two archbishops being imprisoned, and all the other bishops refusing obedience. If one of the first acts of the reign of Frederick William IV. was the complete capitulation of the government, nevertheless, throughout the whole of Germany the dispute provoked the opposition of the Catholic party to the state. In Döllinger, Görres, Möhler, the Catholic liberal ideas had exponents full of intellectuality. The result was that in Prussia the position of the state towards the Catholic Church was fatally weakened, and throughout the whole of Germany the Catholic Church, if not as yet ultramontane, became hostile to the state, being at the same time clerical, and, as such, popular and liberal. In 1844 the first exhibition of the coat of Treves took place, and a year afterwards the first Catholic Journeymen's Union was founded. Finally the bond between Catholics and Protestants was likewise dissolved: Döllinger's distressing history of the German Reformation appeared in 1846-1848. At

the same time the movement of secession within the High Church ritualistic party in the English Church, which was then beginning and still continues, strengthened essentially the general position of Catholicism and led to an intensification of the feeling against Protestantism.

Even in the free air of *Protestant* spiritual life the *antitheses* became more pronounced, and conflicts between them were ready to arise. German science, released from its bondage to theology, and having removed the last remnants of romanticism, soared aloft in an unsuspected way. *Philosophy*, severing its connection with Christianity, and first giving itself up to the contradictory pessimism of Schopenhauer, who represented the world, though still in an idealistic way, as will and idea (1844), but only in order to deprive the world-will of any reasoning and purposive idea and so to make the individual will feel disgust rather than pleasure in existence; or, secondly, to the materialism of Feuerbach, who thought of "Philosophy and Christianity" (1839) as connected only in the sense that the former showed the latter to be the great illusion and spiritual disease of mankind, the result, as all religions are, of egoism and fear. A nobler product of the Romantic period was German *historical science*, as supported and accompanied by its older sisters, archæology and philology, now reconstructed by Winkelmann and F. A. Wolf, and filled with a new and great import by the ideas of the state and national life. The vast work of the *Monumenta Germaniæ*, suggested by Stein, began to reveal the real facts regarding our past in the Middle Age, and for the first time Leopold von Ranke, in

his *History of the German Reformation*, and so in a subject which he himself has described as the most important in our national affairs, provided a model of objective historical writing based upon the documents of the time.

This growth of independent knowledge could not fail to influence Protestant *theology*, which, entering into open scientific competition, and now hampered rather than helped by its preconceptions, was obliged to fight for its position in the universities of Germany. The spirit of Schleiermacher and Hegel continued to rule the whole of the succeeding period. Just as in the ancient Church people had to labour for centuries in order to work out the suggestions made by (Irenæus and) Origen, and the history of dogma may lead us to understand how this was done, so the further development of theology in the nineteenth century and its divisions are bound up with these two men. Thus even the gnostic Hegel seemed to many like a Father of the Church, while others, more correctly, felt that the chief task was to get quit again of the strange spirit of pantheistic speculation and the new admixture of theological and philosophical problems. But in both liberal and conservative elements could be found, and conclusions drawn from them. Theologians were divided into a *right* and *left*. While on the one side men like Schweizer and, later, Lipsius followed more in the real track of Schleiermacher, the spirit of Hegel had established itself in a special way in the seminary at Tübingen, whence the master himself had emerged into public life. In the study of dogmatic history and the history of the Church, Hegel's

idea of development necessarily had particularly fruitful results. Here Baur rendered immortal services, while Hase, who also began at Tübingen, as a lecturer at Jena, a distance away and full of the Goethe traditions, made short work of the old rationalism, though his *Church History* (1834) showed that he had little sympathy with orthodoxy. Strauss, again, the lecturer of Tübingen, had sat at the feet of Schleiermacher and Hegel; his *Life of Jesus* (1835), the first work to apply modern historical criticism in a most uncompromising way to the most important material, dazzling people also by the brilliance of its language, produced a storm of indignation. The appearance of such works could only serve to confirm the views of those who followed Schleiermacher in thinking that all theology should be derived from the concrete consciousness of the Church, and should serve the Church, but who felt with Hegel that the Church, by a quite correct and rational tradition, had in its dogmas and symbols developed the absolute truth. If both points of view were combined, a new confessionism was obtained, together with a new establishment of the old objective contents, by means of a modern appeal to subjective experience and speculation (school of Erlangen). Hengstenberg travelled along an independent path from philosophy to neo-Lutheran orthodoxy; his *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* he made the instrument of an attack which was often extravagant. Between the two parties which were separating from one another, and also between Schleiermacher and Hegel, the theologies of conscience and speculation, a mild and kindly *mediating theology* tried to find a reconciliation.

It did not aim at a greater unity, but the result was that it provided a quantity of suggestions, for most of which we are indebted to the much-beloved Richard Rothe.

This mediating party was important in the field of *church politics* as well, since it represented the idea of union defended with such peculiar warmth by K. J. Nitzsch. But here precisely the incredibly violent way in which the state pressed the introduction of the liturgy, in Silesia here and there employing military force, a kind of Dragoonade, only helped to strengthen the confessional development. Ultimately the Lutheran communities which had refused to submit and so were marked off as a distinct sect, in 1845 were recognised as the church of the "separated old-Lutherans." Beyond this, the general untenableness of a system of purely state church was demonstrated for all others. The new king Frederick William IV. must be duly thanked that respect for church and religion had led him to create, differently from his father, an atmosphere for their own movement, not only for Catholics, but for Evangelicals as well. What was known as the first general synod of 1846, being in truth an assembly of church notables, started, under Nitzsch's influence, the project of a new ecclesiastical constitution, and a year later withdrawal from the national church and the formation of new religious communions were regulated by an edict of toleration. Hopeful as these beginnings were, a new catastrophe now occurred.

We must regard the *years 1848-70 or 73* as forming a new section. The February revolution in Paris which put an end to the rule of Louis Philippe,

the citizen king, and first produced a pure democracy, the revolutions in Austria-Hungary, and the small revolutions in Germany, in which political questions, national questions, and questions of constitution but not of social conditions, were in the foreground, introduced it. Prussia, too, ultimately in 1850 obtained its constitution, but the national hope of a German Empire under Prussian guidance was again disappointed. Indeed, the demonstrations of Frederick William IV. in favour of the people were followed by a period of political *reaction* and national paralysis such as filled all patriots with sorrow and anger. The half-Asiatic colossus, Russia, in the reign of Nicholas began to exert its powerful influence, and in France out of democracy had grown the new empire of Napoleon.

The pope, who at the beginning of his reign had shown such liberal moods, now came forward to support the *general movement of reaction*. Driven from the States of the Church, but reinstated by France, Pio Nono became a determined reactionary, intent upon re-establishing, under Jesuit guidance, the old Romanism. It was now that *the clerical movement in Catholicism first became Ultramontane*. In Prussia also it had aimed at the independence and freedom of the Church, at the separation of church and state. The most important step towards this was taken when the new constitution adopted the far-reaching clause of the German fundamental law, laid down by the Frankfort Parliament: the churches shall regulate and rule their affairs independently. Separated from the state and from its own worldly possessions, Catholicism fell back upon Rome. The

great process of secularization at the beginning of the century had proved itself to be a most valuable precondition of the absolute papal domination over the Church. In Austria in the year 1855 the concordat removed all that was left of the Josephine legislation, and other states were so weak as to follow.

From the end of the 'fifties the great national reconstruction began in Italy and Germany. It started from above and was helped by the sword, the leading spirits being the statesmen of genius, Cavour and Bismarck. But just as in Germany the new development brought with it a popular and more liberal tendency, so in Italy in every sense the revival was only possible if helped by the liberal and even radical elements: in addition to Victor Emanuel and Cavour we have Garibaldi. Thus reactionary Catholicism was brought into a double conflict with the house of Savoy, which advanced victoriously; this as early as 1860 confined the pope to what had of old formed the kernel of the States of the Church. Contrary as they were, the events kept equal pace. While in the Syllabus of 1864 the pope openly and on principle refused to have anything to do with progress and modern culture, and in 1870 the *Vatican Council* by declaring papal infallibility added the long-sought coping-stone to the monarchical structure of the Church, Rome became the capital of the new state Italy, the Church state was definitely discontinued, and the pope became the "prisoner in the Vatican" that he always seems to faithful Catholics to be even at the present day. After this in Italy an impassable division was made between national and religious feeling.

That clause of the *German* fundamental law, to the

effect that religious communities must govern themselves, which had been adopted, as in Prussia, by most other German constitutions, was true also as regards the Evangelicals, and strictly taken, meant the end not only of the state church but also of the ecclesiastical power of the sovereign such as had existed in the Lutheran churches since the Reformation. Frederick William IV. had already in 1845 publicly assured people that he "would bless the day when he could restore the power of the Church to the right hands." But here the right hands had first to be made. After a beginning had been made in 1850 by instituting a "Chief Church Council" (*Oberkirchenrat*), even this work received the impress of reaction. A fresh breeze returned only with a change in the government.

After this, of course, the great course of political and national events, so full of tension and surprises, thrust all other interests into the background. But what now took place in the diplomat's study and on the fields of battle is also of the greatest importance to us. Bismarck has a place in church history by the side of his royal master, that model of a pious life both in sunshine and storm, not only because, taking his stand on the highest watch-tower, he preserved a Protestant piety, but because he created a *new German empire with a Protestant head*, completing the work of the Great Elector and of Old Fritz. While Catholic Habsburg, finally separated from the German Federation, was left to its internal discord and problems of Eastern civilization, the new empire, being predominantly an evangelical and North German power, gained the lead upon the



Continent and the position of a great power throughout the whole world.

Allowing for intermissions, the great national tendency, which shaped an imperial constitution with such a strongly democratic colouring, was also to the advantage of the *movement in regard to the constitution of the Church*. Throughout the whole of Germany, in the whole district covered by the old Lutheran churches, apart from Mecklenburg, the state restricted its territorial church power by introducing an associated organization of presbyteries and synods—in Prussia, for instance, in 1873. This, then, is to be regarded as the final completion of a tendency which can be traced back to Stein; and at the same time it is clear that this development of the Lutheran constitution was influenced by the reformed system, through the agency of the Union: the Rhenish-Westphalian Church organization of 1835, which in turn goes back to the Calvinistic Church of the Lower Rhine, was already the pattern in 1846. But the fact that the state did not entirely give up the control, but in the person of the monarch or his minister, and through its own consistories allowed the continuance of the ecclesiastical power of the sovereign, was in accordance with the widened conception of the social functions of the state; it also guaranteed to the churches the means of their existence and an efficient executive for the maintenance of their arrangements, prevented a movement towards the hierarchical ideal of constitution recommended by Stahl, for example, or to the Calvinistic ideal of church discipline, and at a critical period did not give up its influence on the masses.

For the *social question* was already prominent; it had long ago presented itself and had played a part even in 1848. The growth in trade and commerce produced by progress in technical skill, the emancipation of the social personality through a more and more liberal legislation, caused an immense shifting of population and brought into the great towns crowds of people who were no longer reached by the organization of the Church and became accustomed to live without it. The supplementary organization of home missions set in motion by Wichern and others devoted to the ministry of love was not nearly sufficient to prevent the unbelief of educated men from penetrating deeper and deeper amongst the lower classes. While amongst these a philosophic materialism, made accessible even to the superficially cultured by such works as Büchner's *Force and Matter*, flourishes, there arises at the same time a materialistic doctrine of political economy which supplies a scientific foil to the practical aims of social democracy. The national Lassalle has to give room to the international Marx, in whom Hegel's pantheism had been converted into materialism.

Christianity again felt itself to be threatened in its very foundations. Strauss, in *Der alte und der neue Glaube, Die Halben und die Ganzen*, advanced to a position of open denial, and Schopenhauer's enervating Indian wisdom now first acquired its true force. In wide circles people turned aside from illusive philosophy to do homage to an empiricism or a positivism which drew the line at the experiences of the senses, and repeated with resignation the words of Du Bois-Reymond, "We do not know, and shall

never know." In addition to historical criticism, which proceeded on its way without compromise, natural science, which now celebrated its triumphs in the work of Robert Mayer, Helmholtz and others, monopolized the interests of education, impressed its methods and principles deeply upon the intellect and feelings of young men, and left no room for eternal blessings, while compelling the earth to transform more and more magnificently our outward life. When Darwin's theory of descent was promulgated, the idea seemed to swallow up the Creator-God and the dignity of man.

The Evangelical Church found itself face to face with this emergency in a state of aggravated *internal dissension* which efforts for union such as the free church congresses and the Eisenach conference of church governments, creations of the first advance after the year 1848, could not remove. Nor could the Protestant Society (*Protestantenverein*) help, which, founded in 1865 with the high aim of reconciling modern culture with Christianity, and at the same time intent upon promoting the development of a more liberal constitution by the community, numbered even Rothe amongst its founders and included so orthodox a writer as Mich. Baumgarten. Ultimately it became expressly liberal, did not refrain from impoverishing Christianity even in its deepest thoughts, the ideas of redemption, and came to aggravate the situation, though, as the present writer knows, it has encouraged many earnest exponents of science who have been obliged to take their hard and lonely course, without swerving, by the precipices. Once more South-West Germany proved itself to be the

home of liberal views. The Tübingen school in the classical land of pietism practised and taught keen but reverent criticism, and the church of Baden, under Schenkel's guidance, turned quite into the paths of liberalism. On the other side, and even more powerfully, pre-eminently in North Germany, the new orthodoxy and confessionalism pushed their way to the front. The annexation of Hanover and Schleswig-Holstein brought purely Lutheran churches into the body of the Prussian state, and also in the Prussian Union that confession separated and finally (1875) organized itself as what is known as the "Positive Union." The Lutheran churches gained new sympathy with one another. Erlangen enjoyed its period of greatness with Thomasius and Hofmann, men of great and firm character, and from the year 1868 Luthardt, with Leipzig as his headquarters, in the *Allgemeine Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, conducted the campaign on behalf of the Lutheran Confession. The common work of love carried on in the *Gustav-Adolf-Verein* and in the Home Mission, both of which arose earlier, but did not flourish until after 1848, was declined by the strict confessionalists: Petri in Hanover opposed Wichern, and the Lutheran *Gotteskasten* supplemented the *Gustav-Adolf-Verein* in a way of its own. The foreign missions were also organized quite in a confessional way. While the North German mission passed through its crisis and was transferred from Lutheran Hamburg to Reformed Bremen, the original Hermannsburg mission sprang up in the neighbouring Hanover, its founder being L. Harms, who found in the old church organization of Lüne-

burg the ideal for his colonial mission amongst the native Christians of India.

Thus we find antitheses everywhere. We are more and more impressed with the fact that the period is a critical one. It is followed by *the period of the last generation down to the present time*, which, being our own, can only be touched upon.

The *antitheses* have further increased. In the first place, that *between belief and unbelief*: among the cultured class, who have sought a substitute in the monistic fantasies of Haeckel, in the deliberately anti-Christian "master morality" of Nietzsche, and in the extravagant individualism of a naturalistic and decadent art; among the people, by some of whom the lamentable attempts were made on the hero-emperor, and who in organizing social democracy created an organized world full of active hostility to the churches and to Christianity, religion being officially degraded by being made a private matter at the very moment when the people were summoned to take an active share in the work of the Church. But the hideous monster, anarchism, is present amongst all civilized peoples. In the second place, there is the opposition between *Catholicism and Protestantism*. When Bismarck returned home in triumph from war, he found the internal enemy already garrisoned in the "Tower of the Centre," and the great "Kulturkampf" against it resulted in a defeat for the master of statecraft. Since 1870 Jesuit Ultramontaniam has pressed to the front everywhere, thrown a net, as it were, over the peoples, and shut off the masses of Catholic people commended to its care from the rest of the world, just as Social

Democracy has kept its own people apart. In Germany in the last decade the Centre became quite a trump card and we learnt to live under a Catholic Chancellor and President of the Reichstag. On the other hand, the Protestant world, especially after the year of the Luther Jubilee, 1883, armed itself for a stouter defence: the Society for the history of the Reformation entered the field with the implements of science, the Evangelical Association (*Evangelischer Bund*) with more popular implements. And in the *Evangelical Church* how great was the contrast introduced amongst the people by the Christian press and the popularization of science! There can be no doubt that to the orthodox layman science, when applied to the matters of Christianity, as such became suspected, while on the other hand theology more and more welcomed the results of exact and historical science. People had and still have a criterion in the continually repeated demand that the Church should have a share in the appointment of theological professors; its fulfilment would mean the end of Protestant theology as a science by the side of others. And in theology itself, how great an opposition between the "critical" and "positive" attitude, and, what is more, judged by the standard of the gospel, what an unchristian exaggeration of these differences; what an amount of personal jealousy and unworthy misrepresentation!

But many and increasing as the oppositions always are, we observe also indications of a *growing reconciliation*. In view of the unbelief of cultured persons it must be particularly emphasized that the

dashing attack of materialism is slowing down. Haeckel's *Riddle of the Universe* has on its philosophical side met with annihilating, even contemptuous, criticism. Kant has again come to receive high honour in our philosophical lecture-rooms, a new depth has been given to psychological researches, and a higher appreciation of the peculiarly religious life has become almost universal. In face of the unbelief of the people, it may be pointed out that the often announced secession of the masses from the German territorial churches has not come, and the neglect of church duties bears no relationship to the percentage of Socialist votes. Christian men have devoted their lives to the work of pulling down the walls which prevent the mass of the workers from being spiritually affected by Christian forces, and out of the home missions has arisen the Christian and evangelical social movement.

The question of the relationship of Catholicism and Protestantism has lately brought us the greatest surprises. Apart from the fact that modern commerce, which everywhere throws the confessions into confusion and creates an entirely new diaspora, is effecting quietly its work of reconciliation, during the last years a deeply affecting movement of the evangelical revival has been at work in Catholic countries, especially in Austria. The old damage produced by the period of Counter-reformation is beginning in one quarter and another to be repaired. And in France the movement, which has taken root particularly among the clergy, is supported by a "Kulturkampf," waged by the radical Republicanism against the Church which in so many

ways is allied to the monarchical party, and even leads to the separation of the Church from the State. But in Italy also, and even in Spain, an active evangelization is working with gradually increasing success. Everywhere it is the incompatibility of modern culture and of national interests with the theocratic system of the Middle Age that leads people to exclaim "Away from Rome!" To meet it German Catholics have proclaimed a Catholic "Renaissance," and declared that "progress is a principle of Catholicism," well knowing that to condemn progress with the Syllabus is to cut the Church off from history and consign it to a lingering death. In spite of all its outward pomp and show we are overpoweringly impressed with the feeling that its greatness is hollow. Greater, more far-reaching and more full of hope than all the other facts we have mentioned, is the new fact that amidst the terrible convulsions of its political and social life the Russian empire has opened the door to toleration, and so has made it possible for the gospel to melt the sluggish mass of a *Greek* Catholicism steeped in picture worship. Here, if anywhere, a great hour has dawned.

Opposition to Rome has actually brought *Protestants* throughout the whole world, especially in Germany, closer together. By the side of the free associations proceeding from the people, a closer union of the German church governments has paved the way for a more powerful protection of common evangelical interests, especially in the diaspora, which now extends over the whole earth. Popular revivals help. The territorial church, which aims at being and



will be more and more the church of the people, is seen in its present form of constitution to be a form adapted to safeguard in freedom historical continuity and to reconcile tradition with progress. Among theologians there arises a party which, even at its start going far beyond Albrecht Ritschl, though finding in him particularly powerful expression, seeks, with many faults indeed, though certainly with much truthful courage and earnest piety, to become spiritual master of the position created by modern science. Tired of the old watchwords "liberal" and "orthodox," it agrees with the orthodox in appreciating historical facts and the work of the Church, puts a personal relationship with Christ as the Redeemer in the centre of life and of doctrine, just as Pietism and Schleiermacher had done, is ready to allow modern culture and science their due, and religion its connection with morality, just as the Enlightenment and Kant had done, and by all this thinks it has discovered simply a better understanding of the gospel and of Luther, and so a higher unity. In a certain sense we may make this addition: apart from science, but also from confessionalism, there has arisen among the Christian people a new pietistic movement towards holiness, impelled again particularly by English and Americans, and with its many small communities it has actually called to life one great community extending beyond the limits of the territorial churches.

Let us take a last glance at the whole. The number of forms and antitheses ranging from the compact organization of the Vatican Church to the individual liberty of the American congregational

communities is ultimately simply a proof of the power and wealth of the common source, the historical figure of Christ. And the whole of this "Christian Church" throughout the whole world is making powerful strides towards removing the last and greatest opposition, and towards overcoming Mohammed and Buddha, just as long ago it overcame Zeus and Wodan. It is evident that the time draws near when Japan, the new great power of the Far East, and so the colossus of Mongolian humanity, a pagan power allied with England, must make a decision. But the more the leading rôle in Europe and America devolves upon the Teutonic race, which also is the predominantly Protestant race, the greater Protestantism's share and obligation in this world-problem become, and in view of the position which we Germans have gained in a greater Germany beyond the seas, the duty and impulse have increased amongst us, to bring to pagans the same understanding of the gospel which through Luther and since his time we have made our own. The result of a "missionary century" will soon be twelve million Christians in pagan lands, a much greater proportion of whom have been won in the last quarter than in the first three put together. To-day there is no longer any Church or any party which refuses to undertake this, the greatest of all tasks, *the mission to the world*. The fact that it is one of the main features of present-day Christianity is an indication of life, and means a consciousness of strength and fills us with confidence. The faith is assured of victory in the future. Moreover, sober historical reflection, drawing its conclusion from the

facts of the past, will not make it seem presumptuous if, looking forward to the future, we see the lines of Church History converging in a time when all peoples "hear His voice," and the religion of humanity has measured the compass of the earth.

*Vladimir*

## SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER ON RELIGIOUS THOUGHT AND LIFE IN ENGLAND DURING THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

THE student who, without being an expert in theology or theological history, wishes to obtain some general notions as to religion in England during the past century, will more easily unravel the tangled skein if he grasps separately three main strands. These are the three great movements which can be traced in their working through a great part of the century: the Evangelical movement, the Tractarian or Oxford High-Church movement, and the Liberal movement. Of these the first was most influential early in the century; the other two may be regarded as more or less synchronizing, though the period of greatest activity of the second precedes that of the third. Of course there are many other movements that cannot be brought under any of the three. Nor did any of the three act in isolation. We see action, reaction, and interaction under various circumstances, resulting in the complexity of the religious condition in which we find England to-day. Further, if we look back into the earlier history of church principles and developments in the country, we seem to see, if not the origin, at

least a forecast of each of the three as far back as the middle of the seventeenth century. Nevertheless, we may be justified in grouping the chief religious tendencies of the century about the three movements respectively, seeing that the chief controversies that agitated the Church, and often the nation, during that time, were on account of the principles asserted by the representatives of these causes. But in so doing we must bear in mind that the outlines drawn by the historian, like those of the artist, cannot correspond entirely to the world of actual life.

In a general survey, we cannot trace separately the history of every church and religious denomination under which Christians in England are grouped, and at the same time it seems highly unscientific to confine our observations to one church—the Anglican. It will be found, however, that the Evangelical and the Liberal movements have been going on at the same time both inside and outside the pale of conformity to the English Church. The other—the Oxford movement—though its after-effects are in many cases to be found among Nonconformists, was essentially an agitation within the Anglican Church. It could not be otherwise, since it was mainly concerned with questions as to the sacerdotal and sacramental system in which the dissenters, speaking generally, did not believe, and the validity of Anglican orders, to which they were profoundly indifferent.

The Evangelical school is perhaps to be regarded as an offshoot of the great Methodist Revival. Certainly its leaders were greatly influenced by the leading Methodists, especially by Whitefield, though the fact that before such influence can be traced,

there were, in the English Church, men whose piety was of the "evangelical" type, might induce us to conjecture that such a school might possibly have arisen even if Wesley and Whitefield had never appeared.

The most eminent man among the Evangelicals at the beginning of the century was John Newton of Olney, best known to readers of English literature as the admired friend of the poet Cowper. Newton had been sailor and slave-dealer, and in his youth had travelled much and lived a wild life. Later, however, he changed his whole manner of living, and, partly under Whitefield's influence, became a most energetic country clergyman. He afterwards obtained a parish in London, and died in 1807. His power as a preacher and as a man was very great, and had considerable influence on some other prominent men of similar sentiments to his own.

Of these none was more thoroughgoing or more respected than Thomas Scott, whose history of his own religious development, *The Force of Truth*, is mentioned with great respect by a man so different in type as John Henry Newman, on whom, in his youth, the book had great influence. He also wrote a voluminous commentary on the Scriptures, and some other works. He lived in retirement and generally in poverty, in country and town alternately, a hard-working clergyman, of little attractiveness, but exemplary devotion to his duties. He died in 1821.

Other members of the school were the two Milners, who worked at church history from a strongly anti-papal point of view, but with a sincere sympathy for all that they could recognize as true Christianity

through all the ages. There were also several members of the Venn family, of whom the most notable, Henry Venn, died before the beginning of the century. His son was rector of Clapham, and therefore lived at the focus of evangelical influences. Another man of weight, who embraced evangelical principles and laboured to set them forth during a long and laborious life, was Charles Simeon, of King's College, Cambridge. Simeon was noted for his sermons preached at Trinity Church, Cambridge, and had a great deal of influence over several generations of undergraduates.

Among the laity we find as representatives of Evangelicalism at its best, the statesman and philanthropist William Wilberforce, Zachary Macaulay, father of the historian, Mrs Hannah More, a literary woman of considerable talent and character, who urged the necessity of improving the frivolous education of women, and Henry Thornton of Clapham, a man of great wealth and munificence, whose house became a kind of hospitable centre for all evangelical labours. The tendency of men of this way of thinking to look to Clapham as their headquarters led to their receiving the name of the "Clapham Sect." The other place chiefly associated with their religious and public efforts is Exeter Hall, in the Strand, the earliest assembly room for huge meetings by which the operations of the "sect" were made popular.

Yet after all, the members of this school or society did not form a sect properly so called. All that have been mentioned above were members of the Church of England, and had neither a theology nor a set of

practical principles peculiar to themselves. In theology they were generally Calvinistic, or at least inclining towards Calvinism. In church government they preferred Episcopacy, but drew no very hard and fast line between episcopal and non-episcopal churches. The earlier evangelical clergymen had no scruple against officiating in buildings other than those of the English Church, especially in the "chapels" founded by Lady Huntingdon, the patroness of Whitefield and his followers. For the attainment of truth nothing seemed to them necessary except an open Bible and a devout spirit individually enlightened by divine grace. Thus Scott worked out—or seemed to himself to have found out—the whole system of orthodox belief from the Bible only, dispensing, not only with Church tradition, but with all the resources of science and philosophy. Similarly, in making his *Commentary*, his whole method of operation was to compare Scripture with Scripture, the result being a monument of industry, of very little profit to any mind not revolving in the same circle. They were indeed *homines unius libri*, and incapable of making any contribution to abstract theology. But in practical apprehension of the tenets they acknowledged they were unusually strong, since they laid all possible emphasis on the witness of individual experience. In general, they held that assurance of personal salvation or the absence of such assurance is a safe test of the state of a man's mind towards truth. Of course such a view might seem logically to lead to antinomianism. Practically, however, the members of the "Clapham Sect" were pre-eminent in their zeal for the welfare, both spiritual



and material, of their country and of the world at large. The labours of William Wilberforce and of Zachary Macaulay were very effectual towards the abolition of the slave trade. Foreign missions were earnestly advocated by Simeon at Cambridge, and by the leading Evangelicals in London. The work of the Bible Society was zealously prosecuted by evangelical churchmen and dissenters in friendly co-operation. The education of the poor, the reform of prisons, many undertakings of all kinds for the benefit of the people, were set on foot and carried on by the philanthropic energy of the evangelical party.

It seems strange that a set of men who acknowledged the authority of their ecclesiastical superiors and the rule of faith prescribed by their Church, and who showed themselves peculiarly zealous in the cause of the religion professed by the people generally, should have been subjected to a good deal of censure in high quarters. The terms *orthodox* and *evangelical*, which could not, at that time, mark much real doctrinal distinction, were used to distinguish those who kept to the old highways from the innovators. Terms of theological or religious opprobrium are commonly vague, and those used against the Evangelicals as "Methodists" and "Enthusiasts" would be puzzling apart from their history. The term *Methodist* came to be confined to the followers of Wesley, of Whitefield, and of the various religious societies that split off from the main trunks. *Enthusiasm*, in days when much zeal was regarded as dangerous, was equivalent to fanaticism. People naturally timid of extravagance and averse to change and excitement took alarm at signs of

independence which might seem likely to cause further secessions from the English Church. Wesley himself was a Churchman till the day of his death. His followers only found themselves obliged to take up their position as Nonconformists when they had to register their chapels. Whitefield himself had been in Anglican orders, but had broken loose from episcopal control. There can be little doubt that if a spirit of wider comprehensiveness or of compromising diplomacy had prevailed among the Anglican bishops at the time of the Methodist Revival, all those people who left the Church to find scope for their principles would have remained in it, and constituted a very vigorous, perhaps sometimes recalcitrant, branch of the same. As things happened, there remained a large number of persons who sympathized with some forms of Methodism, but were able to accommodate themselves to the rules and rites of the Anglican Church. As Evangelicalism spread, more homogeneity appeared among Low Churchmen and ordinary dissenters, though the secessions of the Methodists were accomplished facts, not to be undone.

In partial explanation of the dread of innovation, even of the most innocent kinds, which tried to curb the renewed religious activity, we must remember that a similar spirit of repression prevailed also in the political world. The cause was the same in both cases: a horror of the unscrupulous attacks on religion, as on social institutions generally, made by the Revolutionists in France; followed by the tension of a great war, which, as commonly happens, had led to a severe, even to an intolerant and arbitrary policy, on

the part of the Government. The example of France could be held up on almost every occasion against advocates of any kind of freedom, diversity, or irregularity. The happy union between church and state and the moderation of church principles in England shared with the British Constitution the credit of having saved us from the calamities that had overwhelmed our neighbours. In both cases, the result was a very desirable stimulus to loyalty, but a serious block to reform. Similarly we see that later, in the middle of the century, the movements towards both Liberalism and Catholicism were at once opposed and stimulated by the continental revolutionary events of 1848.

Yet in spite of opposition, Evangelicalism grew and prospered, and is operative to this day, not only in posthumous influence, but in the character and work of living representatives. Modern evangelicals, however, do not entirely resemble their predecessors. Their theology is less stern, perhaps less consistent and lucid, and never attains to a thoroughgoing Calvinism. In ideals and methods they do not always form a class apart from all others. But they are distinguished by their insistence on the necessity of individual acceptance of revealed truth, by their comparative indifference to forms of church government, by the small place which such questions as that of apostolic succession and of the efficacy of the sacraments occupies in their belief and their teaching, by their acceptance of the Bible, apart from church tradition, as the rule of faith and conduct, and by their cautious and conservative attitude with regard to the progress of historical and scientific criticism.

As has been already said, the religious position of evangelical churchmen and that of the bulk of orthodox Nonconformists are not far apart. The Wesleyan body forms an exception, since it has always borne the distinctive character of its founder, with his hatred of Calvinism and his high view of sacramental grace; also through its peculiarly systematic organization, with its class-meetings for the laity and triennial migrations of the clergy. The Society of Friends, also, hardly comes under the class of evangelical nonconformity. Of late years, dissent in England has in large measure assumed a political character. But in so far as its basis is theological, it is, though greatly broadened and relaxed, in the main evangelical.

In many ways, especially in obliging people to take life and religion seriously, and in protesting against all mere outward formalism, Evangelicalism has deserved well of the Church and the nation. But it bore within it from the first certain defects which became more evident as time went on, and which were bound, sooner or later, to provoke a strong reaction. In the first place, it was deficient in the idea of the Church as a corporate whole. Not that zealous evangelicals have been generally wanting in brotherly feeling towards those individuals who held with them what they regarded as the fundamental truths of Christianity, and who had gone through religious experiences similar to their own. But this feeling is somewhat different from that attachment to the Church as a living organism, or rather as a nursing mother, which has formed a large element in the religion of many devout souls in the great

societies of East and West. Then, again, if not positively hostile, Evangelicalism was, generally speaking, hardly friendly to art or to learning. That which was pleasing to the senses must be jealously watched if it seemed likely to intrude into religion, which belongs to the heart. Learning, if tolerated, should not be overestimated, since it might lead to intellectual pride. The truth, as Evangelicals regarded it, was to be sought by one study only, and that of one book, and that book might receive side-lights but no great elucidation from secular literature. We have seen how Scott wrote his *Commentary*, and how he evolved the whole scheme of Christian doctrine by solitary poring over Holy Writ. The Milners were historians, but they could only view history in the light that shone through their own windows. With all its excellences, Evangelicalism, until modified by fresh influences, was unfavourable to intellectual progress and to either a scientific or a genial human outlook on the world of Nature and of man.

Furthermore—though this may seem accidental—the whole system lent itself very easily to perversion and to caricature. There was a good deal in the mannerisms, affected phraseology, and strained extravagances of the warm representatives of the school which might provoke the satire of popular writers like Dickens (with his Pecksniffs, Chadbands, and little Bethels), and which appealed to the ordinary English sense of humour. Far more important was the moral provocation caused by the exaggerations of preachers and the virulence of religious newspapers. The doctrine of vicarious sacrifice (not that it was

peculiar to the Evangelicals, but that with them it seemed to sum up all Christian belief) might easily be distorted into a comfortable acquiescence in the transfer of one's own penalty to an innocent person. The zeal for "saving souls" often led to personal intrusions into regions which most persons prefer to keep private. The blindness to much that was excellent in mediæval Christianity, modern unorthodoxy, and ancient paganism, tended to produce a narrow and censorious spirit. With the growth of culture and knowledge, the old ways must be expanded, or given up, or else maintained in opposition to counter-enthusiasms of a vigorous kind. The situation was aggravated by the fact that the very work of the Evangelicals themselves had tended to increase the forces to be brought against them. Earnestness in life, habits of self-questioning, moral sensitiveness, care for the public good, recognition of truth as the most precious possession of the soul: these were the fruits of Evangelical teaching. And seeing in what ways opposition had become necessary, it seems quite natural that some of the foremost opponents were drawn from the ranks of the Evangelicals themselves.

The opposition came from two widely separated quarters. In fact it may be said that the Tractarian movement was directed in the first place, not so much against the dominant Evangelicalism, nor even the high-and-dry stagnation which had preceded it, as against the incipient Liberalism which was to come more powerfully forward after the agitation started by the tracts had begun to subside.

Like many other religious phases Tractarianism was

in its earlier phase in the main an academic movement, beginning in the University of Oxford, and appealing chiefly to the clergy and to men of university status. Its instruments were partly the same as those of Evangelicalism, sermons and pamphlet literature, though it did not venture on public meetings, and had originally nothing of a democratic character. But it resembled the other in being guided and made articulate by a few leading spirits, while both its origin and its rapid diffusion were due to the response it called forth in many men's minds. The peculiar and pathetic feature of it is that the leaders who started with the hope of reforming their Church, were many of them carried by the stream on which they had embarked far away from that Church into alien regions of thought and faith.

It is impossible not to regard John Henry Newman as the greatest of the Oxford reformers, though he himself considers Keble to have been the prime originator. Keble, whose views coincided with Newman's during Newman's activity at Oxford, remained in the Anglican Church all his life, and his religious poetry is still very popular in England among all denominations of Christians. Pusey, a learned Hebraist, but out of touch with critical scholarship, was also proof against the Romeward attraction which proved decisive for Newman, Ward, Oakeley, and many of their associates. But those who went and those who stayed acted, for the most part, in good faith. They all started from the recognition of certain defects in the English Church in their day. But while some came in time to regard the Church as, partly through these defects, partly through its

historical position, not entitled to the claim of being a branch of the Church Catholic, the others upheld that claim without reserve, and strove to amend shortcomings.

The complaints uttered, chiefly in the *Tracts for the Times*, of which Newman, originally an Evangelical himself, was the principal writer, related both to the doctrine and the discipline of the Anglican Church. The teaching of many of the clergy had become, it was said, anti-dogmatic, and thus religion was being reduced to "mere sentiment." The demand for an infallible authority in questions of faith had not been adequately met by those who would send all inquirers to individual study of the Bible, seeing that different individuals came to different conclusions. Hence the need for a continuous inspired tradition. Religious discipline had become lax, ascetic practices, confession, observances of sacred seasons and of church customs, had fallen into desuetude. The clergy had ceased to exercise the power of "binding and loosing" conferred on them at ordination. Baptismal regeneration and the real presence in the Eucharist were denied or explained away, and the apostolic succession of the bishops was ignored or treated as an affair of merely historical interest, doubtful as fact, and of no practical importance.

The main object which the Oxford reformers, in preaching and in writing, pursued unweariedly from 1833 onward was the revival of sacerdotal authority, with strong insistence on the efficacy of the sacraments. This was naturally accompanied by a more elaborate ritual, with gorgeous ceremonial on special



occasions. Indeed, the ceremonial side of the movement was that which most forcibly drew the notice of the general public, attracting people of musical taste and generally æsthetic temper, and repelling those who regarded such ceremonies as childish and as likely to distract the worshippers from higher things. For the most part, the leaders were not so much interested in ritualism as in theological study. A good deal of attention was given to the writings of the Fathers, whose statements were accepted as authoritative, and to certain periods and phases of church history. The primitive Church and the mediæval Church became objects of reverent study. The Tractarians were naturally out of sympathy with the Protestant Reformation, both on the continent and in England. The relative shares of the crown and the clergy in the Reformation settlement came to have a much more than historical interest, as the validity of priests' orders and the whole claim of the Anglican Church to be the rightful descendant of the mediæval Church in England depended on the interpretation given to the events of the sixteenth century.

It was part of the task undertaken by the Oxford leaders to make it possible for those who shared their views to act as clergymen of the English Church, and gradually to accustom the laity to their principles and practices. One great difficulty in the way was the necessity on the part of all candidates for ordination to sign the Thirty-nine Articles. It had long been practically acknowledged that these formulæ were not entirely consistent with portions of the liturgy, nor, perhaps, with one another, so that

a certain latitude of interpretation had become a necessity. But it was hardly to be denied that unless words were considerably forced from their evident meaning, the compilers of the Articles had meant to affirm Protestant doctrine as to justification and election, and to condemn a great part of the teaching of the Church of Rome. In Tract XC. Newman tried to show, partly by dwelling on what the Articles did *not* say, that it was possible to take them in a sense that did not injure the Anglo-Catholic conscience. The tract aroused a fierce opposition, and its censure was followed by the retirement of Newman from his active life in the university. A few years later, after much quiet meditation on the position of the English Church, and after a distinct rebuff from the Roman Catholics, who regarded his *via media* as no better than Protestantism, he abandoned all hope of compromise, and was received into the Church of Rome. He was followed by large numbers of the clergy and laity. In 1850 there occurred a celebrated trial (the "Gorham case"). A High-Church bishop had tried to prohibit a clergyman from taking a living in his diocese because he did not satisfactorily answer questions put to him on the subject of baptismal regeneration, but the bishop lost his case. This was for many the "last straw." The Church of England, it was said, was hopelessly Erastian, bound hand and foot to the state.

A curious result of all this has been that in general the demand for the disestablishment of the Church has come from High Churchmen and political Nonconformists, the Low and Broad Church

being generally opposed to measures of the kind, and anxious to avoid the complete secularization of the state or the collapse of the national church. The immediate effect, however, was a great increase in the numbers and zeal of the Roman Catholics in England. These had for a long time been a quiet and unaggressive party, but the energy and ability of Cardinal Wiseman, the papal policy in founding English bishoprics (1850), and still more the zealous activity in the causes of catholic education and of social reform displayed by some of the converts, has made the Roman Catholics far more weighty a body in England than they had ever been since the Reformation. The gradual removal of all their political and social disabilities is partly cause, partly effect, of this increase in influence and numbers.

And quite apart from its influence as regards Roman Catholicism in England, the Oxford movement has had far-reaching results. Some of its leading ideas, especially that of the historical continuity of the Church from the beginning, and of the obligation laid on churchmen to perpetuate ecclesiastical order apart from individual preferences, have become more or less rooted in the minds of Anglican clergy and laity. With regard to ritual, even what is considered decidedly "low" at the present day, would have seemed dangerously "high" half a century ago. It is to the Oxford movement that we owe the greater frequency of services (especially of celebrations of the Holy Communion), better church music, a growing appreciation of architecture, as well as much more which might seem

accidental rather than essential to the character of the movement. The popular feeling against the High-Church party has in part been overcome by the devoted labours of many High-Church clergymen in the poorest parts of our great cities, notably those of Father Lowder in East London and of Father Dolling in Portsmouth. A good many institutions at first suspected as Roman in origin, notably that of sisterhoods and—to a much smaller extent—of brotherhoods for ministering to the poor, and also for missionary work, have become recognized as desirable, and sometimes even been copied by Protestant Non-conformists. The character of personal piety among religious members of the English Church has tended to approximate to the Catholic ideal, though regular confession and submission to spiritual direction are still comparatively uncommon. Many clergymen whom Evangelical influences could never have reached, have learned from Oxford a certain assiduity in their professional work. On the whole, the High Church movement has been productive in English society generally of more devout habits of life and reverence for sacred things and places, a revival of the relation between religion and art, which had seemed likely to be completely estranged, keener sympathy with many phases of life, past and present, in many ways a wider outlook over things human and a stronger aspiration after things divine. The chief evils that came in its train were a tendency to materialism and formalism in shallow natures, and—far more evidently prejudicial—occasions of strife both within the Church and between the Church and those outside.

It is unnecessary to dwell on the wearisome conflict in which the bishops of the English Church have from time to time been engaged for many years with certain clergymen who have felt conscientiously bound to introduce into the Anglican services sundry additions—such as the use of incense, special adjuncts to the communion service, etc.—which had no warrant in the Prayer Book. These conflicts have been considerably embittered by appeals made by the opposite party to the anti-papal feeling of the general public, and incitement to violent means of resistance. The strong opposition of the bulk of English Churchmen to the practice of auricular confession, against the abuses of which (since, if permitted, it is not authorized) no safeguards have been devised, has led to very acrimonious feeling against those who advocate a custom which they cannot legally enforce. But disturbances of the Church from such causes as these are, generally speaking, temporary and local, and not seriously alarming if met in a reasonable and tolerant spirit.

More serious, from some points of view, is the widening of the cleft between churchmen and dissenters, which is one of the outcomes of the Oxford movement. Whereas the Evangelical movement has tended to minimize all differences between sincere Christians of most denominations (Roman Catholics and Unitarians being practically excluded), the leaders of the Anglo-Catholics drew a hard and fast line between the members of episcopally governed churches and those outside their pale. High Churchmen, if cultivated and courteous, are ready enough to give personal recognition to individual piety and

merit. It is common to find clergy of all denominations serving on public bodies. The books of learned Nonconformists are even admitted into clerical training colleges. Yet the notion (not universally prevalent in any High Churchmen, but formidably strong) that Nonconformists, as such, are in a state of schism, and that the differences between their services and those of the Church are of kind and not of degree, is fatal to any reasonable prospect of reunion or even of religious co-operation on an equal footing.

To turn to the movement towards Liberalism in religion, we have to note that here we are dealing with groups of heterogeneous tendencies, not, as previously, with a distinct speculative school or practical party. Our liberal leaders fall into many widely divergent groups. In fact, the name by which we would seek to denote them collectively is by no means satisfactory. That of *Rationalists* or *Free-thinkers* might seem in some ways better, but would include some distinctly non-religious elements. Both words have been used of them by their opponents, and so acquired an unfortunate connotation. To Newman Liberalism meant a rejection of all beliefs and principles that could not be explained and justified by human reason. But many whom he called Liberals in this sense might well have retorted by applying the name of rationalist to all who use, in speaking of what is divine and incomprehensible, language and arguments applicable only to things that come within the scope of human definition and analysis. However this may be, it seems necessary to group together those thinkers who, in order that religion should retain and extend its place in all our

life and thought, would aim at harmonizing our religious ideas and motives with all the results of a progressive knowledge and culture.

It would be quite superfluous in a sketch like the present to distinguish the different ways in which modern thought and discovery have been brought into conflict with various articles of religious belief, whether such were derived from study of the Scriptures or from acceptance of the dogmas of the Church. The Evangelical party was naturally the least capable of compromise. The furthest length that it could go was to allegorize certain portions of Old Testament narrative and to lay less stress than before on some of the theological doctrines it continued to hold. High Churchmen were in some ways less inflexible, since where the Church had pronounced no definite decision, some liberty of thought could be allowed. Thus a good many learned High Churchmen have frankly accepted the established results of historical criticism with regard to the Old Testament, and in a less degree as to the New, saving of course the statements affirmed in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds. But the stress that they are bound to lay on the principle of church authority is necessarily adverse to complete freedom. The reconstruction or reinterpretation of religious beliefs in harmony with the scientific and historical tendencies of the time has chiefly been undertaken by men who have broken loose from the older parties, and who may be, very generally, classed together as Liberals.

In the treatment of Christian doctrine, Liberal teachers have severally adopted two very different courses. The easier one, and that which commonly

appears safer for persons — especially preachers — without much power of abstract thought, is to leave dogma, as much as possible, alone for the present, and to insist much on moral principles, with the private and public duties that result therefrom. This is the line taken by a good many social reformers, who often show impatience of doctrinal discussions which distract the energies required for the amelioration of practical life. The other course is to insist on doctrine as something which is of inestimable value, but which has been obscured through appropriation by one or another party, and which needs to be set forth in its essence, apart from accidental accretions, or, in so far as it must have forms, to be put into such as are appropriate to modern needs. This was the task accepted by the distinctly theological leaders of liberal thought, especially by Samuel Taylor Coleridge († 1834), Frederick Denison Maurice († 1872), and Frederick William Robertson († 1854).

Coleridge, who is now better known as poet than as thinker, was one of the first to bring the Kantian philosophy, or the more intelligible parts of it, within the comprehension of English readers. Although in his younger days he had for a time been a Unitarian, he finally came to regard the main doctrines of Christianity, and even the formularies of the English Church, as embodying the philosophic principles of his rational theology. His conservatism, which was one of his chief characteristics, showed itself, not in any objection to progressive thought, but in his anxiety lest any portion of truth once grasped should be lost to coming generations. In his old age, the “prophet of Highgate Hill,” as Carlyle called him,



was much resorted to by persons distressed by modern problems, in the hope that his transcendentalism might enable them to walk by a new light along the ancient paths.

Maurice was yet more theological than Coleridge, and perhaps more intensely attached to ancient forms, though at least equally progressive. In his earlier days he even commended the Thirty-nine Articles, as furnishing useful lines to guide theological teaching. Though not always lucid in thought and style, he exercised great influence, both at the University of Cambridge, where he held the chair of Moral Philosophy, and in the country generally. This was partly due to his singularly attractive personality. He was a generous friend of struggling causes, such as that of higher education for women and of greater independence for working men, a zealous admirer of goodness wherever it appeared, ready to uphold on all occasions the spiritual view of life against the material. He was involved in various controversies, partly on account of his rejection, in its popular form, of the doctrine of everlasting punishment. He objected very strongly to basing Christianity on external evidences. Though a strong Churchman, he did not share the tractarian view of Church authority, which from his point of view was mechanical rather than spiritual. His religion, like that of others of his school, had a strong mystic element.

Robertson of Brighton was younger than Maurice, but died earlier. His influence was chiefly exercised though the sermons he preached 1848-54, of which many, in abbreviated form, were published after his death. His views were what would commonly be

called eclectic, but he definitely repudiated that name. He held that in most controverted questions each side had discerned part of the truth, and that the right solution was not a *via media* between them, but a bold combination of both. He applied this somewhat Hegelian method to such questions as those of baptismal regeneration, reverence for the Virgin, Sunday observance, and to many more. He lived a lonely life, and his influence was almost entirely posthumous. It was due chiefly to the profundity of his thought, his admirable lucidity of expression, and his moral enthusiasm.

All the leaders of this school are very emphatic on the moral side of religion, and most of them would make moral rectitude, with personal reverence for the character of Christ, the one test of Christianity. This was especially the case with Thomas Arnold († 1842), a strong opponent of the Tractarians, to whom his church views seemed altogether Erastian. Arnold's career as head master of Rugby and as educational reformer was remarkable. Perhaps he did more than any other man to establish the principle, now recognized in all English schools, of giving the elder pupils a position of responsibility, and trusting to the honour and conscience of the boys as far as was consistent with necessary discipline. He so far succeeded at Rugby, that his pupils went out into the world marked by a very strong sense both of duty and of religion.

Stanley, Arnold's pupil and biographer († 1881), was distinguished beyond all Broad Churchmen for his breadth of view and his sympathy for many varieties of thought and character. While he was Dean of

Westminster he had scope for carrying out many of his ideas, especially in making the Abbey a mausoleum for England's great men, even when they had had little or no part in the English Church. His works helped to strengthen the historical interest taken both in ecclesiastical and in Hebrew history, and his sympathy with pagans and heretics would have aroused greater alarm if it had not been combined with a singular gentleness and refinement of character.

Sympathy with non-Christian ideas, ancient and modern, was a natural outcome of wider and more thorough historical study. The very notion that Christians might have something to learn from pagans and sceptics might shock the narrower schools of thought, but it was much dwelt upon by men like Stanley, Maurice, and Maurice's pupil, Charles Kingsley († 1875). Kingsley was abler as man of letters than he was as theologian. He was also a great lover of open-air life, a keen sportsman, and something of a naturalist. In politics he was an ardent social reformer. The robustness of his character and tastes acquired for the type of religion which he proclaimed to others and followed himself the name of "muscular Christianity."

In 1860 a book appeared which aroused perhaps as much acrimonious feeling as the "Tracts for the Times" had done. This was *Essays and Reviews*, by seven Liberal Churchmen, mostly of Oxford, on subjects connected with Biblical criticism and Christian evidences. Among the writers were Professor Jowett, afterwards Master of Balliol College, the translator of Plato, and Dr Temple, Arnold's

successor at Rugby, afterwards Bishop of London and finally Archbishop of Canterbury. The views expressed in these essays are so little repugnant to those very generally held at the present day that it is difficult to understand the outcry raised against them, or the censure passed in an ecclesiastical court. This censure was, however, reversed on appeal to the Privy Council. Shortly afterwards an attempt was made to dethrone Colenso, Bishop of Natal, in consequence of a work he had published on the Pentateuch, showing its composite character and denying its Mosaic authorship. This attempt, however, did not prove entirely successful.

It was naturally to be expected that the results of Darwin's researches in the middle of the century, and the popularizing of them by Huxley and others, should meet with unreasonable fears and equally unreasonable negations in the first instance, and that subsequently they should be recognized as necessitating a general revision rather than a wholesale destruction of Christian belief. Apart from its bearing on Old Testament accounts of creation, the principle of evolution has found its way into Biblical as into other historical and comparative studies, and has there, as everywhere, led to a more rational understanding of what was already known, as well as to discoveries of the unknown.

There are, of course, a good many people who have not found their scientific knowledge compatible with religious belief, or who have considered religion to be rendered unnecessary by such knowledge. Herbert Spencer, as is well known, relegated religion to the regions of the "Unknowable."

Huxley introduced the word *Agnostic* to denote a person who declined to express an opinion as to the existence of a supernatural world, and the word has had considerable vogue. It is loosely used to designate a great variety of persons outside the churches, from those who vigorously deny to those who passively acquiesce. Positivism should be mentioned as a system which has never had much standing in England, though it has had a few brilliant representatives.

In a sketch like the present it is inevitable that the controversial side of religion should become prominent. In point of fact there is a good deal of religious thought and work in England which does not belong to any particular school or even to any particular church, and there are a good many persons who are unconsciously indebted to various regions for their ideas and principles. Thus it is not uncommon to find people who are Liberal by conviction, moderately High Church in observance, and Evangelical in general tone. Two regions, that of learning and that of philanthropy, are beyond the strifes of sect and party, though the same cannot unfortunately be said as to elementary education. The solid New Testament studies of the great Cambridge triad, Lightfoot, Westcott, and Hort, are universally acknowledged. The revision of the authorized version of the Bible in 1884, which, with all its defects, was a notable work, was carried out by a committee of various denominations. The greatest British Old Testament scholar of recent times is the Scotsman Robertson Smith. Nonconformists have shared in the opportunities for increasing their

theological learning and general culture by the gradual abolition of university tests. Some sects that had been peculiarly isolated, especially the Unitarians, of whom the greatest recent representative is James Martineau, and the Society of Friends, have received more general recognition of their intellectual and social achievements.

It must further be borne in mind that though we have had solely to speak of theological thoughts and studies, the English clergy and many of the laity derive a good many of their religious ideas from non-theological literature. Of the poets, Wordsworth is the great example of devout recognition of God in Nature. Tennyson, who was a close friend of Maurice, has worked out in "In Memoriam" the triumph of faith over bereavement and despair. Browning stimulates in his very numerous admirers a genial tolerance and cheerful optimism. Among other literary men we have had Carlyle preaching the necessity of changing "old clothes" while retaining the body within them, and dwelling on Dr Johnson's exhortation, "Clear your mind of cant"; Ruskin, Wordsworthian in his reverence for truth and beauty; John Stuart Mill, brought up without any religion and never exactly a Christian, nor even a theist, but singularly appreciative of moral excellence, and whole-hearted in his love of liberty and of truth; and Matthew Arnold, who, though perhaps hardly just to some who were working on his own lines in a more methodical way, has set forth more clearly than any one else of the last generation the relations between culture and religion.

The most influential leaders of the nineteenth

century in letters and in action have, with very few exceptions, been respectful to the spirit of Christianity, and on the whole tolerant of its various forms. Many of the most energetic workers, in trying to raise the life of the poor, are and have been sincerely religious.

Meantime, it is interesting to see how the tendencies to democratic and even to imperial organization, to coalitions of smaller bodies into larger ones, and to closer co-operation of various kinds, has shown itself among the religious societies of our day as much as in commerce and politics. A very remarkable institution of recent times is the Salvation Army, the military name of which is no mere figure of speech, seeing that it is maintained in the strictest discipline under a "General" with *quasi*-military subordinates. The Army was founded by "General Booth" and his wife Catherine, originally of the Primitive Methodist persuasion, but (like the earlier Methodists) unable to find full scope for their activities in their own church. The object of the army is to effect the social and religious regeneration of mankind. Its theology is not very scientific, appealing strongly to individual experience, and (like Wesley's) anti-Calvinistic. Of late it has taken up the great problems of Labour, Pauperism, Congestion of Population, and the like, and has appealed successfully to a large public for funds to carry out social schemes.

Yet the fact cannot be denied that at the present day the working classes, taken as a whole, are indifferent, not only to the Church of England, but to all religious organizations, and that, at the opposite extreme, among the most highly educated

and intellectual people the majority are no longer found to be regular attendants at religious services. If the English are still at bottom a religious people, and the present sketch would seem to show that they are, we may expect to find during the present century fresh efforts towards the task which the nineteenth century, with all its energy, left unachieved.



## INDEX OF NAMES

- Abelard, 211.  
 Abraham, 82.  
 Agilolfings, 183.  
 Agricola, Court-preacher, 261.  
     D'Ailly, Cardinal, 235.  
 Alaric, 143, 168 f.  
 Alcuin, 217.  
 Aleander, 254.  
 Alexander III., Pope, 201.  
     VI., Pope, 237, 242.  
     Severus, 82.  
 Ambrose, 86, 138, 154, 170.  
 Andrea, Joh. Val., 291.  
 Anselm of Canterbury, 209, 212,  
     213, 219.  
 Ansgar, 194.  
 Antony, St, 120.  
 Antoninus, Pius, 73, 79, 93.  
 Apollonius of Tyana, 10, 13 f.,  
     82.  
 Apollos, 32.  
 Aristides the Apologist, 35, 112.  
 Aristotle, 211, 239.  
 Arndt, Johann, 290.  
 Arnim, L. Achelis von, 320.  
 Arnold, Matthew, 374.  
 Arnold, Thomas, 370.  
 Athanasius, 103, 120, 125, 147,  
     166, 208.  
 Attila, 168 ff.  
 Augustus the Strong, 288.  
 Augustine, 69, 86, 119, 138,  
     145, 154 ff., 170, 193, 208,  
     213, 225, 241, 268.  
 Augustus (Octavian), 2, 3, 11.  
 Avitus of Vienne, 178.  
 Bacon of Verulam, 284.  
 Barnabas, 48.  
 Basil the Great, 122.  
 Baumgarten, Mich., 339.  
 Baur, Chr. Ferd., 332.  
 Benedict of Aniane, 199, 222.  
 Berengarius of Tours, 217.  
 Bernard of Clairvaux, 214.  
 Bismarck, 335 f.  
 Boccaccio, 240.  
 Boniface (Winfrid), 184 f.  
     VIII., Pope, 232 f.  
 Booth, "General," 375.  
 Borgia, 237.  
 Du Boys-Reymond, 338.  
 Brentano, Clem., 320.  
 Browning, 374.  
 Büchner, 338.  
 Cæsar, 3.  
 Cæsar Borgia, 237.  
 Cajetan, 253.  
 Calixt, George, 291.  
 Calixtus of Rome, 67, 115, 161 ff.  
 Calovius, Abraham, 289, 299.  
 Calvin, 263, 267, 278.  
 Cappadocians, the three great, 86.  
 Caracalla, 4, 161.  
 Carloman, 185.  
 Carlyle, 368, 374.  
 Cartesius (Descartes), 275, 284,  
     296.  
 Cassiodorus, 179.  
 Cavour, 335.  
 Charles the Great, 140, 185 ff.,  
     193 f., 196 ff., 204, 217, 263.

- Charles the Bald, 209.  
   V., 258, 263 f.  
   I. of England, 279.  
   X. of France, 326.  
   Augustus of Saxe - Weimar,  
     297.  
 Charles Martel, 184.  
 Chemnitz, Mart., 289.  
 Chrysostom, 86.  
 Claudius, Matthias, 314.  
   of Turin, 218.  
 Clement of Alexandria, 56.  
   of Rome, 33, 48, 56, 153.  
   VII., Pope, 263.  
   XIV., Pope, 302.  
 Cleopatra, 120.  
 Clovis, 140, 173 f., 178 f., 180,  
   189, 195.  
 Clotaire I., 175.  
 Cola di Rienzi, 239.  
 Colenso, 372.  
 Coleridge, S. T., 368.  
 Colman of Lindisfarne, 177.  
 Commodus, 75, 79.  
 Constantine the Great, 5, 71 f.,  
   84 ff., 101, 119, 137, 143,  
   154, 167 ff., 173, 180, 189,  
   223.  
 Constantius Chlorus, 84.  
   I., Emperor, 154.  
 Contarini, Legate, 259.  
 Copernicus, 286.  
 Cowper, 350.  
 Cromwell, 275 f., 280, 305.  
 Cyprian of Carthage, 66 ff., 70,  
   118, 134, 145, 162, 166,  
   170, 189, 237.  
 Cyril of Alexandria, 137, 147,  
   166, 217.  
   of Jerusalem, 132.  
   the Apostle of the Slavs, 194.  
  
 Darwin, 339, 372.  
 David, 189.  
 Decius, 71, 74, 81, 83, 116 f.  
 Descartes (Cartesius), 275, 284,  
   296.  
 Diderot, 304.  
  
 Diocletian, 84 f., 118.  
 Dionysius of Alexandria, 99.  
   the Areopagite, 149.  
   of Corinth, 54.  
 Dioscurus of Alexandria, 166.  
 Döllinger, 329.  
 Dolling, Father, 364.  
 Domitian, 74 f.  
 Donatus, 119.  
 Duns Scotus, 212, 260.  
  
 Eckart of Cologne, 242.  
 Edward III. of England, 233.  
   VI. of England, 270.  
 Einhard, 187.  
 Elizabeth of England, 270.  
 Ennodius of Ticinum, 170.  
 Epictetus, 8, 12.  
 Erasmus, 243, 260.  
 Erigena, Scotus, 209.  
 Ernst of Saxe-Gotha, 300.  
 Eusebius of Cæsarea, 19 f., 73.  
  
 Falk, Joh., 326.  
 Felicitas, St, 82.  
 Felix, St, 138.  
 Feuerbach, 330.  
 Fichte, 312, 324.  
 Fiesco, Count of Lavagna (Immo-  
   cent IV.), 231.  
 Fox, George, 285.  
 Francke, the elder (Aug. Herm.),  
   292.  
   the younger (Goth. Aug.) 299.  
 Francis, St, 224, 243.  
 Frederick I. Barbarossa, 196,  
   200, 230.  
   II., 202, 230, 236.  
   the Great, 295, 301 f., 303,  
   336.  
   the Wise, 297.  
 William, the Great Elector  
   294, 336.  
   I., King, 294.  
   II., King, 317.  
   III., King, 318, 325 f., 327.  
   IV., King, 329, 333 f., 336.

- Galen, 113.  
 Galerius, 84.  
 Galileo, 283.  
 Gansfort, Wessel, 241.  
 Garibaldi, 335.  
 Gellert, 295.  
 Gerhard, Joh., 289.  
 Gerhardt, Paul, 290.  
 Gerson, 235.  
 Giordano Bruno, 283.  
 Görres, 329.  
 Goethe, 275, 297 f., 314 f., 320,  
 332.  
 Gorham, 362.  
 Gregory of Nyssa, 134.  
 Gregory I., the Great, Pope,  
 170 f., 176, 181, 184, 202,  
 219.  
 II., Pope, 184.  
 III., Pope, 184.  
 IV., Pope, 191.  
 VII., Pope, 192, 199 f., 254.  
 IX., Pope, 203.  
 of Tours, 173.  
 Grimm, Jacob, 320.  
 Grotius, Hugo, 286.  
 Gustavus Adolphus, 272, 290.  
 Hadrian, 2, 6, 73, 78.  
 Haeckel, 341, 343.  
 Hamann, 314.  
 Hannah, 138.  
 Hardenberg, Friedr. von  
 (Novalis), 319.  
 Harms, Klaus, 328.  
 Ludwig, 340.  
 Hase, Karl, 332.  
 Hegel, 36, 324, 331 f., 338.  
 Hegesippus, 54.  
 Helmholtz, 339.  
 Helvetius, 304.  
 Hengstenberg, 332.  
 Henry I., 195.  
 III., 197 ff.  
 IV., 196, 200 f., 254.  
 V., 304.  
 VI., 201 f.  
 Heraclitus, 18.  
 Herder, 314.  
 Hermas, 33, 49, 113.  
 Hesiod, 18.  
 Hippolytus, 115.  
 Hofmann, J., Chr. K. von, 340.  
 Holbach, 304.  
 Homer, 18.  
 Hort, 373.  
 Hume, 308.  
 Huntingdon, Lady, 352.  
 Huss, 244 f., 246, 253.  
 Hutten, 254.  
 Hutter, 289.  
 Huxley, 372 f.  
 Hypatia, 121.  
 Ignatius of Antioch, 33, 48 f.,  
 56 f., 59, 62 f., 95 f., 125,  
 130, 164.  
 of Loyola, 265.  
 Innocent III., 202 f., 204, 212,  
 224 ff.  
 IV., 203.  
 Irenæus of Lyons, 44, 54, 56, 65,  
 91, 96, 99, 103, 207, 322,  
 331.  
 Irene, Empress, 150.  
 Isaiah, 26.  
 Jacobi, 314.  
 James the Just, 37.  
 Epistle of, 49.  
 Jesus Christ, 16, 19 ff. *et passim*.  
 Jerome, 8, 122, 154, 160, 220.  
 John (of Apocalypse), 62, 71.  
 the Apostle (and Evangelist),  
 32, 37, 40, 44, 131, 159,  
 161, 177.  
 Damascene, 149, 209.  
 the Baptist, 26.  
 Jowett, B., 371.  
 Julian the Apostate, 85.  
 Julius Africanus, 116.  
 Jung-Stilling, 314.  
 Justin Martyr, 63, 73 f., 79, 93 f.,  
 109, 112, 158.  
 Justinian, 72, 86, 89, 101, 106,  
 142, 209.

- Kant, 275, 299, 312 f., 315, 343 ff.  
 Keble, 359.  
 Kepler, 286.  
 Kingsley, Charles, 371.  
 Knox, John, 270.
- Lamennais, 329.  
 Lamettrie, 304.  
 Lassalle, 338.  
 Lavater, 313.  
 Leibnitz, 294, 296.  
 Leo I., Pope, 168 f., 172, 178,  
 193, 202, 225.  
 III., Pope, 187.  
 Leonides, 82.  
 Leontius of Byzantium, 209.  
 Leopold I., Emperor, 288.  
 Lessing, 297.  
 Licinius, 84.  
 Lightfoot, 373.  
 Lipsius, 331.  
 Locke, 297, 308.  
 Lombard, Peter, 220.  
 Lothar I., Emperor, 191.  
 Louis Philippe of France, 333.  
 Louis XIV. of France, 288, 321.  
 XVIII. of France, 326.  
 Louis the Bavarian, 234, 236,  
 239.  
 Lowder, Father, 364.  
 Lucrezia Borgia, 237.  
 Luke, 31.  
 Lullus Raimundus, 210.  
 Luthardt, 340.  
 Luther, 90, 244, 250-261, 276,  
 297, 327.
- Macaulay, 351, 353.  
 Maccabees, 14.  
 Maistre, Count de, 326.  
 Marcus Aurelius, 53, 72, 74 f.,  
 79, 81, 93, 114.  
 Marcion, 52 f., 61, 64.  
 Martineau, James, 374.  
 Mark, 31.  
 Mary, 137.  
 Marsilius of Padua, 234, 243.
- Martin of Tours, 156.  
 Marx, Karl, 338.  
 Matilda, Queen, 197.  
 Matthew, 31.  
 Maurice of Saxony, 263 f., 266  
 288.  
 Maurice, F. D., 368 f.  
 Maxentius, 84.  
 Maximian, 84.  
 Maximus, Confessor, 209.  
 Mayer, Robert, 339.  
 Melancthon, 217, 255 ff., 260  
 284, 323, 327.  
 Melito of Sardis, 65, 74.  
 Mendelssohn, Moses, 298.  
 Methodius, Apostle of the Slavs  
 194.  
 Metternich, 326.  
 Milner, 350, 357.  
 Mill, J. S., 374.  
 Mohammed, 145 ff., 346.  
 Möhler, 329.  
 Montanus, 53 f., 114.  
 More, Hannah, 351.
- Napoleon I., 190, 195, 275, 318  
 321.  
 III., 334.  
 Nero, 71, 74 f., 77 f.  
 Nerva, 75.  
 Newman, J. H., 350, 359 ff.  
 Newton, 286 f.  
 John, of Olney, 350.  
 Nicolai, 298.  
 Nicholas I., Pope, 192 f., 209.  
 I., of Russia, 334.  
 Nietzsche, 341.  
 Nilus, St, of Rossano, 223.  
 Nitzsch, Karl Imm., 331.  
 Novatian, 118.
- Oakeley, 359  
 Occam, William of, 212.  
 Oedipus, 26.  
 Origen, 82 f., 98 ff., 103, 116  
 209, 322, 331.  
 Orpheus, 82.

- Otto I., 195 ff., 237.  
 III., 197.
- Papias of Hierapolis, 29.  
 Paschasius Radbertus, 217.  
 Paulinus of Nola, 138.  
 Paul the Apostle, 1, 7 f., 32 f.,  
 38 ff., 45 f., 59 f., 63 f., 109,  
 111, 129, 131, 159, 252.  
 of Samosata, 99.  
 Pelagius, 155.  
 Penn, William, 285.  
 Perpetua, St, 82.  
 Pestalozzi, 310.  
 Peter, 30, 32, 37, 45 f., 59 f.,  
 64 f., 159 ff., 168.  
 Peter Lombard, 220.  
 Peter the Great, 288.  
 Petrarch, 240 f.  
 Petri, Pastor, 340.  
 Philip II. Augustus of France,  
 226.  
 IV. the Fair, 232 ff.  
 of Hesse, 261 ff.  
 II. of Spain, 270 f.  
 Philip the Arabian, 74 f., 82.  
 Philo, 17, 19 f., 94.  
 Philostratus, 82.  
 Pilate, 7, 74.  
 Pippin, 185.  
 Pius IX., Pope, 329, 334.  
 Plato, 8, 17 f., 52, 210, 239, 255.  
 Pliny the Elder, 159.  
 the Younger, 80, 112 f.  
 Plotinus, 9, 13 f.  
 Plutarch, 8.  
 Polycarp of Smyrna, 44, 62 f.,  
 73, 78 f.  
 Pompey, 10.  
 Pomponius Mela, 2.  
 Porphyry, 9.  
 Prudentius, 169.  
 Pseudo-Isidore, 192 f.  
 Pusey, 359.  
 Pythagoras, 8.
- Radbertus, Paschasius, 217.  
 Raimundus Lullus, 210.
- Rainald von Dassel, 201.  
 Ranke, Leopold von, 330.  
 Ratramnus, 217.  
 Reuchlin, 243.  
 Rienzi, Cola di, 239.  
 Ritschl, Albrecht, 345.  
 Robespierre, 305.  
 Robertson, F. W., 368 f.  
 Roscellinus, 212.  
 Rothe, Richard, 332 f., 339.  
 Rousseau, 304, 314.  
 Ruskin, 374.
- Sailer, Bishop, 321.  
 Savonarola, 242.  
 Schelling, 320.  
 Schiller, 313.  
 Schleiermacher, Friedr. Dan.,  
 315 f., 320 ff., 331 f.,  
 345.  
 Schopenhauer, 330, 338.  
 Schweizer, Alexander, 331.  
 Scott, Thomas, 350, 352, 357.  
 Scotus Erigena, 209.  
 Semler, Solomon, 298.  
 Seneca, 8, 17 f.  
 Septimius Severus, 81 f., 114,  
 161.  
 Severinus, 156, 221.  
 Sigismund, Emperor, 235.  
 of Poland, 272.  
 Simeon, Charles, 351, 353.  
 Simeon the Stylite, 122.  
 Siricius, Pope, 167 f.  
 Smith, Robertson, 373.  
 Spangenberg, 310.  
 Spencer, Herbert, 372.  
 Spenser, 292 f.  
 Spinoza, 209, 284, 296, 320.  
 Stahl, 337.  
 Stanley, A. P., 370.  
 Stein, Freiherr von, 318, 327,  
 329, 337.  
 Stephen, 37.  
 Strabo, 159.  
 Strauss, 332, 338.  
 Sylvester I., Pope, 167

- Tacitus, 14, 19, 77.  
 Tatian, 63, 94.  
 Tauler, 242.  
 Telesphorus of Rome, 78 f.  
 Teller, 299.  
 Temple, 371.  
 Tennyson, 374.  
 Tertullian, 66, 73 f., 91, 98, 102,  
     112, 115, 135, 145, 153 f.,  
     159 f., 163, 170.  
 Tetzl, 252.  
 Theodore of Mopsuestia, 104.  
 Theodora, Empress, 150.  
 Theodoric the Great, 170, 178.  
 Theodosius I., the Great, 86,  
     101, 311.  
     II., 72.  
 Theodulf of Orleans, 188 f.  
 Theophilus of Alexandria, 166.  
 Tholuck, 299.  
 Thomas Aquinas, 211 f., 260.  
     of Bradwardine, 241.  
 Thomasius, Christian, 295.  
     Gottfried, 340.  
 Thornton, Henry, 351.  
 Tiberius, 73 f.  
 Trajan, 1 f., 74 f., 78 ff.  
  
 Ulpian, 72.  
 Urlsberger, 309.  
  
 Valentinus the Gnostic, 60 f.,  
     64.  
 Valentinian III., 169.  
  
 Valerian, 70 f., 83, 116 f.  
 Venn, Henry, 351.  
 Victor of Rome, 161, 177 f.  
 Victor Immanuel I., 335.  
 Voet, Gisbert, 291 f.  
 Voltaire, 295 f., 302.  
  
 Ward, 359.  
 Wegscheider, 299.  
 Wesley, 308 f., 349 ff.  
 Wessel, Gansfort, 241.  
 Wessenberg, Freiherr von, 321.  
 Westcott, 373.  
 Whitefield, 308 f., 349 ff.  
 Wichern, Joh. Hinr., 336, 338  
     340.  
 Wilberforce, William, 351 ff.  
 Wilfrid, 178.  
 William of Occam, 212, 234 f.  
     of Orange, 282.  
     I., Emperor, 336.  
 Wilsnack, 205.  
 Winfrid (Boniface), 184 f.  
 Winkelmann, 330.  
 Wiseman, Cardinal, 363.  
 Wöllner, 317.  
 Wolf, Fr. Aug., 330.  
 Wolff, Christ., 296.  
 Wordsworth, 374.  
 Wyclif, 244 f., 246.  
  
 Zacharias, Pope, 185.  
 Zinzendorf, 293, 310, 315, 320 f.  
 Zwingli, 285, 260, 267.

## INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- Abyssinian churches, the, 147.  
 Academy of Berlin, the, 294.  
 Act of Toleration, the, 282.  
 Acts, the, references to, 37-8,  
     149.  
 Adult baptism, 216 (cf. Baptism).  
 Adventism, 270.  
 Africa, the Donatist controversy,  
     118 f.  
 Agape, the, 129.  
 Agnostic, term introduced by  
     Huxley, 373.  
 Albigenses, the, 225-6.  
 Alexandrians, the, 103-4.  
 Allah, worship of, 146.  
*Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek*,  
     298.  
 Almsgiving, 110, 112.  
 Anabaptist movement, the, 262,  
     270.  
 Anarchism, 341.  
 Anchorites, 121 (cf. Hermits,  
     Monasticism).  
 Anglican orders, validity of, 349.  
     state church, the, 270, 287,  
     349 ff.  
 Anglo-Catholics (cf. Tractarian  
     movement).  
 Anointing-oil, 138.  
 Anselm and the investiture  
     question, 209 f.  
     cited, 210, 214.  
     the father of scholasticism,  
     209.  
 Antioch, church of, 63.  
     conference at, 38.
- Antioch—  
     mixed community of Jews and  
         Greeks at, 37.  
 Antiochenes, the, 104.  
 Apocalypse of St John, 62, 71.  
 Apollonius of Tyana, a typical  
     prayer, 13.  
     and the reform of pagan cults,  
         10 f.  
     biography of, 82.  
 Apostles—  
     John, 32, 37, 40, 44, 131, 159,  
         161, 177.  
     Paul, 1, 7 f., 32 f., 38 ff., 45 f.,  
         59 f., 63 f., 109, 111,  
         129, 131, 159, 252.  
     Peter, 30, 32, 37, 45 f., 59 f.,  
         64 f., 159 ff., 168.  
     saints and martyrs, festivals  
         of, 137.  
     successors of (cf. Apostolic  
         succession).  
 Apostolic Fathers and extra-  
     canonical writings, 63.  
 Apostolic succession, the, 56,  
     58 ff., 66, 162 ff., 168,  
     278, 360, 363.  
 Apostolicon, the, Luther ex-  
     plains, 90.  
 Arab invasion, the, 145-6.  
     religion, the, 145.  
 Arian controversy, the, 101, 208.  
 Arianism, 152 f., 154.  
 Aristides, 35, 112.  
 Aristotelian literature, 239.  
     theology, 211.

- Aristotle's definition of the state, 235.
- Armada, the, 271.
- Armenian church, the, 147.
- Arnold, Dr. and Rugby, 370.
- Ascetic pietism, 270.
- Asceticism, 221 ff., 256.
- Athanasius and, 120.
- Augustine embraces, 119.
- Asia Minor, the seat of the  
monarchical episcopate, 56.
- Astronomers, celebrated, 286.
- Athanasian Creed, the, 101,  
103 f., 208.
- Athanasius, 103, 120, 125, 147,  
166, 208.
- Atheists, Plutarch on, 8.
- Attila, 168.
- Augsburg, 258.
- confession, the, 259, 267.
- the peace of, 267, 270.
- Augustine and the Donatists,  
119.
- and Greek dogma, 154.
- confessions of, 241.
- life of St Anthony, 120, 241.
- on the City of God, 119, 193.
- Petrarch's favourite book,  
241.
- teaching of, and its results,  
213 f.
- Augustinian order, the, 119.
- "Augustinism," 119, 154 ff.
- Auricular confession (cf. Con-  
fession).
- Austria and Jesuitism, 271.
- and Protestantism, 301.
- evangelicalism in, 343.
- Avignon, Pope Boniface at, 233.
- Avitus, Bishop, 178 ff.
- Baptism, 60 ff., 127, 132 ff., 160,  
173, 216.
- adults only baptized in the  
ancient church, 216.
- early Christian preparation  
for, 132.
- Baptism—
- of children, 216.
- of Clovis, 173, 178.
- the Lord's Prayer and, 133
- the pagan kathartike and, 13
- Baptismal regeneration and t  
Gorham case, 362.
- Baptists, the, 282.
- Barbarossa (cf. Frederick I.).
- Basle, Council of, 235 f.
- missions, the, 310, 325.
- Baur, C. F., and the Tübing  
school, 35, 45, 332.
- Bavarian, Louis the, 234, 23  
239.
- concordat of 1817, the, 321
- constitution of 1818, the, 39
- Benedictines, the, 223.
- Berlin Academy, 294.
- University of, 322.
- Bible, the, 243, 255, 315.
- a Greek translation for Jew  
16.
- revision of, in 1884, 373.
- societies founded, 309.
- Society, the, 353.
- Biblical criticism, 367, 371.
- and evolution, 372.
- Bishops, 55 ff., 91 ff., 114  
160 f., 162, 168, 2  
360, 363.
- confederation of, 68.
- Cyprian on, 67-8.
- divine right of, 162 f.
- episcopal synods, 92 (Synods).
- guardians of code of faith, 9
- Ignatius on the unity of t  
office, 164.
- march of, into the dese  
114.
- of Rome, 160, 162.
- origin of, 54 ff.
- revolt of, 200, 305.
- Boniface VIII.'s *Unam sancta*  
232.
- Booth, William, founds the S  
vation Army, 375.



- Bourges, "pragmatic sanction" of, 236.  
 Brandenburg, German evangelical Christianity in, 293 f.  
 Broad Church (cf. Liberal theological leaders).  
 Brotherhoods, 364.  
 Byzantine church, the, 149, 151.  
 Byzantinism, 86.  
 Byzantium, 145, 226.  
 Calixt, Georg, the father of "Syncretism," 291.  
 Calixtus, Pope, 67, 115, 159, 161-4.  
 Calvin, 263, 267, 278 ff.  
 Calvinism, 268 ff., 290 f.  
   constitution, 268, 277.  
   discipline, 269.  
   dogma of election, 268 f.  
   in England, 270, 279.  
   in France, 270.  
   in Geneva, 278.  
   in Germany, 270.  
   in Holland, 278.  
   in Scotland, 278.  
   in the Netherlands, 270.  
 Calvinist churches, 269 f.  
 Canon—  
   extra-canonical writings, 63 ff.  
   Marcion's, 64.  
   Muratorian, 65.  
   origin and growth of the, 43 f., 55, 61 ff., 160.  
 Canonical and Imperial Roman law, struggle between, 201.  
 Canons of Nicæa, 168 f.  
 Canossa, Henry IV. begs forgiveness from Pope Gregory VII. at, 200 f., 232, 254.  
 Canterbury, Anselm of, 209, 212, 214, 219.  
 "Caroline Books," the, 188.  
 Carolingian renaissance, the, 187 ff.  
 Catechisms of Cyril of Jerusalem, the, 132.  
   of Luther, 259.  
 "Catharists," the, 118, 119.  
 "Catholic Apostolics," the, 270.  
   Austria dislodged by Protestant North German Prussia, 301.  
 Church—  
   and Roman jurisprudence, 206 ff.  
   and the Merovingian kingdom, 175 ff.  
   Apostolic Fathers, period of the, 45, 47.  
   apostolical succession, 56, 58 ff., 66, 162 ff., 168, 278, 360, 363.  
   baptism, 60 ff., 127, 132 ff., 160, 173, 216.  
   bishops, confederation of, 68 (cf. Bishops).  
   canon, the, 44 f., 55, 61 ff., 160.  
   confession, 221, 225, 365.  
   dogma, 89 ff.  
   excommunication (cf. Excommunication).  
   Germanic territorial churches, 182 f.  
   gnosticism, 51 ff., 60 f., 64, 89, 90 ff. *et passim*.  
   Marcion and, 52.  
   Montanus and, 53.  
   literature of, 48, 62 f., 94.  
   main lines of conviction, 50.  
   noteworthy Fathers of, 19, 94 f., 170.  
   organization of the early, 42 f.  
   papacy (cf. Popes).  
   penance, 67.  
   priesthood, 66.  
     higher and lower orders, 68.  
   renaissance, 344.  
   rise of the, 42 ff.  
   rule of faith, 55, 60 f., 89 ff.

- Catholic Church—  
 synods (cf. Synods).  
 theology, 93 ff.  
 value of St Paul's epistles, 46.  
 (Cf. also Roman Catholic Church.)
- Catholic Journeymen's Union, the, 329.
- Catholicism, present-day, that of Trent, 266.
- Celibacy, 112, 115.  
 a condition of monasticism, 110, 115, 224.
- Celtic Church, the, 176 ff.  
 monasticism in, 177.
- Chalcedon, Council of, 147, 169.  
 creed of, 208.
- Charles I. of England, execution of, 279.
- Charles the Great, 140, 185 ff., 193 ff., 196 ff., 204, 217, 263.  
 creates a theocratic imperialism, 188 ff.  
 convenes a general synod, 187.  
 coronation of, 187.  
 magnetic personality of, 190.
- "Chief Church Council," the, 336.
- Children, baptism of, 216.  
 rescue work for, 325.
- Christian, first use of the word, 37.  
 socialism, 329.
- Christians, imperial decrees regarding, 72 ff.  
 famous early, 82.  
 Neoplatonists rivals to, 9.
- Christianity—  
 baptism, preparation for, 132 (cf. Baptism).  
 discipline, 110 ff., 177, 269.  
 dogma, 88 ff.  
 early—  
 a Greek Jew its first historian, 19.  
 a religion of revelation, 28.
- Christianity, early—  
 Aristides on, 35.  
 conditions under which it arose, 1 ff.  
 constitution of the churches, 33 ff.  
 first preachers of, 38 ff.  
 indifference to formulas, 32.  
 literature, 33 ff., 48, 53, 62 ff.  
 Neoplatonists, rivals of, 9.  
 preconditions of, 1 ff.  
 prophets, 23 ff.  
 St Paul on, 1.  
 faith, 88 ff., 355.  
 monasticism, 119 ff. (cf. Monasticism).  
 morality, 107 ff.  
 persecuted by the state, 74 ff.  
 points of, harmonizing with paganism, 110 ff.  
 Roman state and, 70 ff.  
 second birth of, 38.  
 theology, 93 ff.  
 worship, 124 ff.
- Christmas Day, 137.
- Church, the—  
 a new constitution, 229 ff.  
 as landowner, 181.  
 baptism, 127 (cf. also Baptism).  
 Eastern, 4 (cf. Eastern Church).  
 Eucharist, the, 127 ff. (cf. Eucharist).  
 faith, theology, and dogma, 88 ff.  
 of England, 270, 287, 349 ff.  
 penance, 67, 117 ff., 154, 177, 219.  
 secularization of, 114.  
 state, 181, 355.  
 Western (cf. Western Church).  
 (Cf. Religions.)  
*Church History*, 73, 332.  
 Cistercians, the, 223, 224.  
 Clapham sect, the, 351 ff.  
 Clement cited, 75.  
 epistle to the Roman Church, 56.

- Clergy and laity, 66 ff.  
 culture of, 176, 238.  
 higher and lower orders of, 68  
 (cf. Bishops and Priest-  
 hood).
- Clerical training colleges, 366.
- Clovis, baptism of, 173, 178.
- Cænobites, 121 (cf. Monasticism).
- Colenso, Bishop, and his work  
 on the Pentateuch, 372.
- Coleridge and the Kantian  
 philosophy, 368.
- Colman of Lindisfarne appeals  
 to the Apostle John,  
 177.
- Colonial missions, 341.
- Community of Brethren, the,  
 293, 310.
- Company of Jesus (cf. Jesuits).
- Concord, the formula of, 272.
- Conference at Antioch, 37 f.  
 at Eisnach, the, 339.  
 at Ratisbon, 259.
- Confession, 221, 225, 365.  
 made obligatory, 225.
- Confession-churches, 259 ff., 262-  
 263, 267.
- Confirmation, 219.
- Congregationalism in the North  
 American colonies,  
 282-3, 345.
- Constance, Council of, 235 f.,  
 308.
- Constantine the Great, 5, 71 f.,  
 84 ff., 101, 119, 137,  
 143, 154, 167 ff., 173,  
 180, 189, 223.
- "Contemplation," 110-111.
- Coptic - Egyptian church, the,  
 147.
- Corinthians, Epistles to the,  
 references to, 32, 33,  
 111.
- Council of Basle, 235.  
 of Chalcedon, 147, 169.  
 of Constance, 235.  
 of Niceæ, 237.  
 of Trent, 265 ff.
- Councils, Œcumenical, 101, 165,  
 168.
- Court theology, 261.
- Creed, the Athanasian, 101,  
 103 f., 208.
- Cross, the, a sacrament, 138.
- Crusades, the, 201.  
 knightly and civic corporations  
 a result of, 238.
- Cult of genius, 313.
- Cultus of the Caaba, 146.  
 of feeling, 149.  
 piety, 131 f.  
 meal (cf. Eucharist).  
 worship, 128.  
 St Paul on, 129.
- Cyprian of Carthage, 66 f., 70,  
 118, 134, 145, 162, 166,  
 170, 189, 237.  
 a great master-builder, 68.  
 death of, 70.  
 on bishops, 67-8.  
 on the priesthood, 66-7.
- Cyril of Alexandria, 137, 147,  
 166, 217.  
 of Jerusalem, 132.
- Darwin's theory of descent, 339,  
 372.
- Decian and other persecutions,  
 71, 74 f., 81, 83, 116 f.
- De Civitate Dei*, 193.
- Decretals of Pseudo-Isidore*, the,  
 192, 193.
- Deism, 283, 287.
- Descartes, 275, 284, 296.
- Dialectics, Abelard and, 211.
- Die Göttingischen Gelehrten An-  
 zeigen*, 295.
- Diet of Speyer, 258, 276.
- Discipline, 110 ff., 177, 269, 279.
- Disestablishment, demand for,  
 from both Anglo-Ca-  
 tholics and Noncon-  
 formists, 362.  
 opposed generally by Low and  
 Broad Churchmen,  
 362-3.

- Disruption of the Roman Catholic Church, 227 ff.
- Dissent, political, 356.
- Dissenters, 282.
- Dogma, 88 ff.
- Greek, 119, 154.
- of election, the, 268 f.
- Dogmatics, reconstruction of, 323.
- Döllinger's *History of the German Reformation*, 329.
- Dominicans, the, 224.
- Domitian, persecution of, 75, 77, 78.
- Donatist controversy, the, 118 f.
- Dragonnades, the, 306.
- Dutch-English pietism, 291.
- Easter, communions, 132.
- controversy, the, 161, 177.
- Eastern and Western Church, union between, 151.
- Eastern Church, the, 144 ff.
- image controversy, the, 150, 218, 241.
- main types, 4.
- empire a Greek dominion, 144.
- Eclecticism, F. W. Robertson and, 369 f.
- Edict of Nantes, 278.
- revocation of, 306.
- of Nîmes, 278.
- of Speyer, 258, 276.
- of Theodosius, 101.
- Egypt the home of monasticism, 120 f.
- Egyptians, the, 147.
- Eisenach conference, the, 339.
- Election, dogma of, 268 f.
- Ems, the compact of, 302.
- England, papal supremacy abandoned by, 233.
- religious thought and life in, during nineteenth century, 348 ff.
- Roman Catholic bishoprics in, 363.
- English state church, the, 270, 287, 349.
- “Enlightenment,” 275, 283, 295.
- Enthusiasm, 29, 353.
- “Enthusiasts,” 353.
- Episcopal synods, 92, 101, 147, 165, 168, 185.
- Episcopate, the monarchical, rise of, 55 ff.
- Essays and Reviews*, and the writers, 371–2.
- Ethiopic-Abyssinian Church, the, 147.
- Eucharist, the—
- and the Sunday service, 129.
- Augustine's explanation of, 213.
- controversies regarding, 217.
- Ignatius on, 130.
- Lateran Council and, 213.
- offerings at, 135.
- origin of, 127 f.
- symbolism of, 127 ff.
- (Cf. also Lord's Supper, Mass, Transubstantiation.)
- Eusebius: *Church History*, 73.
- Evangelical, alliance at Schmalkalden, 258.
- association, the, 342.
- Church, the, 261 ff., 342, 348, 349, 356.
- movement, the, 282, 348 ff.
- universities, 289.
- Evangelicalism, caricature of, 357.
- in Austria, 343.
- in Germany, 342.
- unfavourable to art and learning, 357.
- Evangelicals, modern-day—
- Macaulay, Zachary, 351, 353.
- Milners, the, 350 f., 357.
- More, Hannah, 351.
- Newton of Olney, 350.
- Scott, Thomas, 350, 352, 357.
- Simeon, Charles, 351, 353.
- Thornton, Henry, 351.

- Evangelicals, modern-day—  
   Venn, Henry, 351.  
   Wilberforce, Wm., 351, 353.  
 Evolution and the Bible, 372.  
   Darwin's theory of, 339, 372.  
 Excommunication, 66, 67, 116,  
   161, 220.  
 Exeter Hall, London, 351.  
 Exorcism, 133, 216.  
  
 Faith, Irenæus' definition of,  
   91.  
   rule of, 55, 60 f., 89 ff.,  
   355.  
   Tertullian's definition of, 91.  
   theology and dogma, 88 ff.  
 Fasting, 110, 112, 115.  
   as preparation for baptism,  
   132.  
 Fathers of the Church, 19, 94 f.,  
   170.  
 Festivals, 137, 150.  
 Fontenay, battle of, 191.  
*Force and Matter*, 338.  
 Foreign missions, 340.  
   Basle organizations for, 310,  
   325.  
 Forgeries, 192.  
 Forty years' schism, the, 234.  
 Franciscans, the, 224.  
   war against the Church, 242.  
 Frankfort-on-the-Main, synod at,  
   187 f.  
 Franks, the, 176, 195.  
 Frederick I. Barbarossa, 196,  
   201, 230.  
 Frederick William, the Great  
   Elector, 294, 336.  
 Free Church movement, the,  
   283.  
 Freemasonry in England, 287.  
   in Germany, 298.  
 Freethinkers, 366.  
 Freewill, the doctrine of, 107 ff.,  
   113.  
 French Revolution, the, 303 ff.  
 Friends, Society of (cf. Quakers).  
  
 Galatians, Epistle to the, refer-  
   ences to, 1, 38.  
 Galileo, 283.  
 Gallicanism, 288, 321.  
 Garibaldi and reactionary Ca-  
   tholicism, 335.  
 Geneva, 270.  
   Protestant Church, 267.  
 Genius, Lavater's definition of,  
   313-4.  
 Gentile Christian Church, the,  
   33.  
 Gentiles, 15.  
 German bishops, revolt of, 200,  
   305.  
   church reorganized by Otto I.,  
   196 f.  
   evangelicalism, 293.  
   mysticism, 315 ff.  
   Pietism, 292.  
   Reformed churches, 272.  
   scientific Periodical, the first,  
   295.  
   territorial churches, 343 f.  
 Germans, the ancient, 152.  
 Germany — the "Enlighten-  
   ment," 295 ff.  
 Gnesiolutherans, the, 271 f.  
 Gnosticism, 51 ff., 60 f., 64, 89,  
   90 ff. *et passim*.  
 Goethe, 275, 297 f., 314 f., 320,  
   332.  
 Gorham case, the, 362.  
 Gospel, a Catholic interpretation  
   of, 246 ff.  
   (Cf. also Literature.)  
 Goths, the, 152.  
*Gotteskasten*, Lutheran, 340.  
 Göttingen University, 295.  
 Grace, the doctrine of, 213.  
 Græco-Roman rule, the, 2 *et seq.*  
   the Jews and, 14-20.  
 Greek, Byzantine church, the,  
   149 ff.  
   dogma, Augustine and, 154.  
   Jews (cf. Hellenists).  
   language predominant in early  
   Christian Church, 3.

## Greek—

- poets and thinkers, 18.  
translation of the Bible, 16.
- Greeks, power of, in the seventh century, 144.
- Gregory of Tours, the Frank historian, 173.  
the Great, monk and Pope, 170 f., 176, 181, 184, 202, 219.  
VII., Pope, 192, 199 f., 254.
- Grimm's *Fairy Tales*, 320.
- Gustav-Adolf-Verein, the, 340.
- Gustavus Adolphus, 272, 290.
- Hanover and Schleswig-Holstein, annexation of, 340.
- Harnack, *Texts and Studies*, 45.  
*History of Dogma*, 47.
- Heathen religions, 7.
- Hebrews, Epistle to the, reference to, 32.
- Hegel's influence at Tübingen, 331.
- Hellenists, 10, 17, 37, 38.
- Henry IV. and the scene at Canossa, 200 f., 232, 254.
- Henry VI. inherits Sicily, 202.
- Herder and historical knowledge, 314 f.  
cited, 22.
- Heretics, Philip of Spain and, 270.
- Hermas, the "Shepherd" of, 113.
- Hermits, 121 (cf. Monasticism).  
Augustinian, 119.
- Hesiod, 18.
- "Hesychasts," 151.
- High Church party, the, 282, 330, 348, 358 ff. (cf. Tractarian movement).
- Historical science, 330.
- History, 173, 319, 324.  
*History of Christian Philanthropy*, 12.

- History of the German Reformation*, the (L. v. Ranke), 331.
- Hohenstaufen, the, 200 f., 238.
- Holland, 271, 278.
- Holy, Communion, celebrations in Anglican Church, 363 (cf. Eucharist).  
Land (cf. Palestine, Jerusalem, Jews).  
Matrimony, sacrament of, 220, 329.  
St Paul on, 109.  
War, the, and a holy alliance, 321.
- Home Missions, 325, 338, 340, 364.
- Homer, 18.
- Huguenots, 271.  
Church of the, 304.  
suppression of the, 288.
- Humanism, 240, 257, 283.
- Huntingdon, Lady, 352.
- Huss, John, 244 ff.
- Huxley introduces the term Agnostic, 373.
- Hymnology, 290.
- Hymns of Prudentius, the, 169.
- Ignatius, of Antioch, 33, 48 f., 56 f., 59, 62 f., 95 f., 125, 130, 164.  
of Loyola founds the Jesuit order, 265 (cf. Jesuits).
- Images and image worship, 150 f., 218.
- Imperial churches (cf. German Territorial churches).  
decrees regarding Christians, 72 ff. (cf. Persecutions).
- Imperium and Sacerdotium, 141, 187 ff.  
Charles the Great, 187 ff.  
decretals of Ps. Isidore, 192 f.  
Gregory VII., 192 ff.  
Hohenstaufen, the, 201 f., 238.  
Imperium temporarily triumphant, 198.

## Imperium—

- Otto I., 195 ff.
- period of the interregnum, 202 f.
- Sacerdotium, its victory, 203, 230 f.

Incarnation, doctrine of the, 97 ff., 104, 125, 134, 213 *et passim*.

Incense in the Anglican Church, controversy regarding, 365.

Independentism, 280.

India, 2.

Indulgences, 177, 240.

Tetzels traffic in, 252-3.

Infallibility, Papal, 170, 206 ff., 214, 335.

*In Memoriam*, lessons of, 374.

Innocent III., 202 f., 204, 212, 224 f.

power of, 226.

Innocent IV., 203, 231.

Inquisition, the, and its work, 226, 265.

Investiture, the question of, 200.

Anselm and, 209 f.

Isidore, decretals of Pseudo-, 192.

Islam, 145-6.

Israelites (cf. Jews).

James the Just, 37.

Jansenist movement, the, 288.

Japan, 346.

Jerusalem, Cyril of, 132.

St Paul and, 39.

the Jewish-Christian church in, 42.

the Pharisees of, 37.

Jesuits, the, 265, 267, 301 f., 321, 341.

in Austria, 273.

Jesus Christ—

as High Priest, 26-7.

as Lord and King, 25.

as Prophet, 24, 25.

Jesus Christ—

birthplace of, 1, 16.

incarnation of, 97 *et passim*.

resurrection of, 29-31.

the Last Supper of, 27, 28 (cf. Eucharist).

the second coming of, 32 *et passim*.

Jews—

as internationals, 15.

and the Greco-Roman world, 14-20.

Holy Land the source of Christianity, 19.

missionary activity, 17.

piety of, 14, 15, 20.

Philo and the, 17.

of the Holy Land, 37.

symbolism of meals, 127 f.

Tacitus on, 14.

their Greek Bible, 16.

John the Apostle, 32, 37, 40, 44, 131, 161, 177.

Epistle of, cited, 110.

Gospel according to, cited, 40, 53, 58, 162, 168.

legendary persecution of, 159. (Cf. also Apostles.)

Judaism in the Roman state, 76 f. (cf. Jews).

Jülicher cited, 44.

Jupiter Capitolinus, the father of the gods, 6.

Jurisprudence and the Church, 206 ff.

Justification by works, 108.

Justin Martyr, 63, 73 f., 79, 93 f., 109, 112, 158.

Justinian, 72, 86, 89, 101, 106, 142, 209.

Kant and his works, 275, 299, 312 f., 315, 342.

Kantian philosophy, Coleridge and, 368.

Kathartike, the pagan, compared with baptism, 132.

Kiel University, lectures at, vi.

- Labour problems, 375.  
 Laity, the, 66 f., 176.  
 Lamennais and Christian Socialism, 329.  
 Language, the Greek, 3.  
 Last Supper, the, 27, 28, 213  
 (cf. Eucharist, Lord's Supper, Mass).  
 Lateran Council of 1215, the, 203, 213, 225, 226.  
   imposing scene at, 226.  
 Leipzig Disputation, the, 253.  
 Leo I., Pope, 168, 169, 172, 178, 193, 202, 225.  
 Liberal movement in England, the, 348.  
   theological leaders, notable—  
     Arnold, Thos., 370.  
     Coleridge, S. T., 368.  
     Kingsley, Charles, 371.  
     Maurice, F. D., 368, 369, 370.  
     Robertson, F. W., 368 ff.  
     Stanley, Dean, 370-1.  
 Liberalism in religion, 366 ff.  
*Life of Jesus*, the, 332.  
 Literary men, influence of—  
   Arnold, Matthew, 374.  
   Carlyle, 374.  
   Mill, J. S., 374.  
   Ruskin, 374.  
 Literature, classical period of, 288.  
   Early Christian, 33 ff., 48, 53, 62 ff., 94.  
   of the early Catholic Church, 48.  
   sacred, 62 f.  
*Loci communes*, Melancthon's, 255.  
 Logos doctrine, the, 95, 98 ff. *et passim*.  
   Origen and, 98 f.  
   Paul of Samosata and, 99.  
 Lord's Prayer, the, 25, 133.  
 Lord's Supper, the—  
   abuses at, 134 ff.  
   Ignatius on, 130.  
 Lord's Supper, the—  
   institution of, 127.  
   preparation for reception of, 132.  
   St Paul on, 129.  
   symbolism of, 127-9.  
 Low Church party, 282, 348 ff.  
 (Cf. Evangelical Church.)  
 Luke, Gospel of, 168.  
 Luther, Martin—  
   and evangelical "Mass," 260.  
   dispute with Erasmus, 260.  
   emancipation of, 253.  
   his catechism, 259.  
   his writings, 254.  
   in the Wartburg, 255.  
   in Worms, 254.  
   meeting with Cajetan, 253.  
   Melancthon and, 255, 260.  
   on the Mass, 259 f.  
   opposes Tetzl, 252 f.  
   Reformation of, 254, 277.  
 Luther - Home near Weimar, 325 f.  
   Jubilee, the, 342.  
 Lutheran church, the, 252.  
   confession, the, 340.  
   Reformation, want of freedom in, 277.  
 Lutheranism, 289.  
 Macedonian empire, the, 2.  
 Madrid, 264.  
 "Magic books," 77.  
 Magic in religion, 215.  
 Marcion and gnosticism, 52 ff.  
 Marcion's canon, 64.  
 Marcus Aurelius, 53, 72, 74 f., 79, 81, 93, 114.  
 Marriage, sacrament of, 220.  
   St Paul on, 109.  
 Marriages, mixed, disputes regarding, 329.  
 Martel, Charles, 184 f.  
 Martyrdoms, 73, 78 ff., 159, 283  
 (cf. Persecutions).  
 Mary-cycle of feasts, 137.  
 Mary Stuart, execution of, 271



- Mass, the, 134 ff. (cf. Eucharist, Lord's Supper, Transubstantiation).  
 Luther on, 259-60.  
 Sacrifice in the, 219.
- Massacre of St Bartholomew's day, 271.
- Materialism, 338.
- Matilda, Queen, 197.
- Matrimony, Holy, 109, 220, 329.
- Matthew, Gospel of, references to, 61, 162, 163, 166.
- Maurice, F. D., and the Thirty-nine Articles, 369.
- Melanchthon and Luther, 255, 260.
- Melito of Sardis cited, 74.
- Mendicant orders, 224.
- Merovingian, kingdom and the Catholic Church, 175 ff.  
 period, the, 181 ff.
- Methodism, 270, 308 f.
- Methodists, 349-50, 353.
- Metropolitans, chief (cf. Patriarchs).
- Middle Age, the, 140 ff.  
 altered condition of the world, 143 f.  
 migrations of peoples, 143 f.  
 monks of, and Augustine, 119.  
 the commands of the Church in, 207.  
 the Eastern Church, 144 ff.  
 the Western Church, 151 ff.  
 two characteristics of the, 186.
- Mill, J. S., 374.
- Milton's *Paradise Lost*, 282.
- Missionary Societies founded, 309.
- Missions, Basle, 310, 325.  
 colonial, 341.  
 foreign, 340.  
 home, 325, 338, 340, 364.
- Mithras cult, the, 10.
- Mixed marriages, dispute regarding, 329.
- Mohammedan religion, the, 145-6.
- Mohammedanism, 146 ff.  
 a vigorous form of monotheism, 146.
- Mommsen, 81.
- Monarchical episcopate, rise of the, 55 ff.
- Monasteries, reform of, 199.
- Monasticism, 20, 53, 109 ff., 119 ff., 123, 177, 220, 223, 240 ff., 242.  
 Augustine and, 119.  
 celibacy a condition of, 110, 115, 224.  
 Christian, and Philo, 20.  
 Egypt the home of, 120 f.  
 errors of, 123.  
 failure of, 123.  
 fasting in, 110, 115.  
 introduction into the West, 122.  
 marriage, avoidance, of, 110, 115, 224.  
 opposition to a hierarchy, 242.  
 "orders" in, 223.  
 Oriental, 121.  
 Philo and, 20.  
 reforms in, 199, 221 f.
- Monophysites, 147.
- Monotheism, 7, 11, 13 ff., 47, 48, 76, 146.
- Montanism, 114, 115.
- Monumenta Germaniæ*, 330.
- Moors and Spaniards, the, 264.
- Moralism, 107 ff., 269.
- Morality, 108 *et seq.*  
 and religion, separation of, 148.  
 discipline and monasticism, 106 ff.  
 division of, 112 ff.
- Muratorian canon, the, 65.
- Mysticism, Augustine's, 241.  
 contemplative, 111.  
 German, 315 ff.

- Nantes, edict of, 278.  
 revocation of, 306.
- Napoleon I., 190, 195, 275, 318, 321.  
 III., 334.
- National churches (cf. German Territorial churches).
- Neo-Alexandrines, the, 125.
- Neoplatonism, 9, 84.
- Nepotism at Rome, 237.
- Nero, persecutions of, 75, 77 f.
- Netherlands, the, 271, 278.
- Newman, J. H. (afterwards Cardinal), 350, 359 ff.
- New Testament, studies, 373.  
 theology, 33.
- Newton of Olney, John, 350.
- Nicæa, canons of, 168 f.  
 council of, 165, 168.
- Nicene Creed, the, 102, 208, 367.  
 N. orthodoxy, Theodosius and, 101, 311.  
 Tractarians and, 361 f.
- Nicholas I., Pope, 192 f., 209.
- Nîmes, edict of, 278.
- Nominalism, 212, 239, 315.  
 superstition increases under, 240.
- Nonconformists and Evangelical Churchmen, similarity between, 356.
- N. brotherhoods and sisterhoods, 364.
- Novatians, the church of the, 118.
- Nuremberg's evangelical "Mass," 260.
- Occam, William of, 212.
- Œcumenical councils, 101, 165, 168.
- Œdipus cited, 26.
- Old Testament criticism, 367, 373.
- Orders of monasticism, 223.  
 of priesthood, 68.
- Ordination, 220.
- Origen, 82 f., 98 ff., 103, 106, 116, 209, 322, 331.
- Ostrogoths, Theodoric, King of, 170, 178.
- Otto I., 195 ff., 237.  
 III., 197.
- Oxford movement, the (cf. High Church, Tractarian movement).
- Palestine, 19, 37.
- Papacy, the, foundation of the state church, 181.  
 origin and history of, 160 ff., 204 ff.  
 power of, 266.
- Papal Bulls, 232, 302.  
 infallibility, 170, 206 ff., 214, 335.  
 letters, forged, 192 f.  
 mismanagement, 232, 234.  
 restoration, 235 (cf. Popes).
- Papias of Hierapolis, 29.
- "Parliament of saints," the, 281.
- Passau, the treaty of, 266 f.
- Patriarchs, 166 f.
- Patrimonium Petri, 181, 321.
- Paul, St., 1, 7 f., 32 f., 45 f., 59 f., 63 f., 111, 129, 131, 159, 252.  
 a prisoner, 39.  
 as preacher and teacher, 38 ff.  
 collection for the poor of Jerusalem, 38.  
 conference at Antioch, 38.  
 journey to Rome, 39.  
 on marriage, 109.  
 (Cf. Apostles.)
- Paulinism, 46.  
 and Gnosticism, 52.
- Pauperism, the problem of, 375.
- Pelagian controversy, the, 155.
- Penance, 67, 117, 118, 154, 177, 219.
- Pentateuch, Bishop Colenso and the, 372.
- Pentecost, Day of, 31.

- Persecutions, 71 f., 77 f., 116 f.,  
283 (cf. Martyrdoms).
- Persian Nestorian community,  
the, 147.
- Peter, 1st Epistle of, reference  
to, 75.  
St, 30, 32, 37, 45 f., 59, 64 f.,  
159 ff., 168.
- Peter's pence, 184.
- Petrarch, the father of Human-  
ism, 240.
- Pharisees of Jerusalem, the, 37.
- Philippians, Epistle to the,  
reference to, 39.
- Philo, 94.  
*On the Contemplative Life*, 20.
- Philosophy, 330.  
classical German, 299, 312.
- Pietism, 291 ff., 309.  
mistakes of, 293.
- Pilgrimages, 240.
- Pius IX., Pope, 329, 334.
- Plato, 8, 17 f., 52, 210, 239,  
255.
- Pliny, the elder, and younger,  
80, 112 f., 159.
- Plutarch and atheists, 8.
- Poetry, German, 297, 313 f.
- Poets and thinkers—  
Browning, 374.  
Greek, 18.  
Keble, 359.  
Prudentius, 169.  
Tennyson, 374.  
Wordsworth, 374.
- Poland, Sigismund, King of,  
272.
- Political economy, a material-  
istic form of, 338.
- Polycarp, martyrdom of, 79.
- Polytheism, 6 ff., 76.
- Popes, notable—  
Alexander III., 201.  
VI., 237, 242.  
Boniface VIII., 232.  
Calixtus, 67, 115, 161 ff.  
Clement VII., 263.  
XIV., 302.
- Popes, notable—  
Gregory I. (the Great), 170 f.,  
176, 181, 184, 202, 219.  
II., 184.  
III., 184.  
IV., 191.  
VII., 192, 199 f., 254.  
IX., 203.  
Leo I., 168 f., 172, 178, 193,  
202, 225.  
III., 187.  
Pius IX., 329, 334.  
Victor, 161.  
Zacharias, 185.
- Positive Union, the, 340.
- Positivism, 373.
- Pragmatic sanction of Bourges,  
the, 236.
- Prayer, 111 f.
- Predestination, dogma of, 280.
- Presbyterianism, 270, 279.
- Presbyters, 56, 277.
- Press, freedom of the, 285.
- Priesthood, order of the, 66, 68,  
136, 361.
- Prophets, 23 ff.
- Protestant Society, the, 339.  
Subjectivism, 306.
- Protestantism and particularism,  
alliance between, 261.
- Prudentius, hymns of, 169.
- Prussian state, reconstruction of,  
318.
- Puritanism, 270, 280, 292, 305.
- Pusey, Dr, and the Tractarian  
movement, 359.
- Quakers, the, 282, 285, 356, 374  
(cf. Society of Friends).
- Rationalism, 296 f., 299 f., 368.  
speculative, 296.
- Rationalists, 366.
- Ratisbon conference, 259.
- Realism, 210.
- Reclaiming heretics, Philip of  
Spain's system of, 270.
- Reformation and the state, 258.

- Reformer of German Protestantism, the, 315.
- Reforms in monasticism, 199, 221 f.
- Relics, worship of, 137 f., 218, 240.
- Religion and state, 6.
- Religion—
- Anglican (cf. Church of England).
  - Arian, 152.
  - Armenian, 147.
  - Byzantine, 149, 151.
  - Coptic-Egyptian, 147.
  - Egyptian, 147.
  - Ethiopic-Abyssinian, 147.
  - Germanic, 140, 152, 157.
  - Greek, 144, 149.
  - Judaic, 76 f.
  - Mohammedan, 146 ff.
  - Novatian, 118.
  - Persian-Nestorian, 147.
  - Roman Catholic, 152, 156 (cf. Roman Catholic Church).
  - Saracen, 145.
- Religious thought and life in England during the nineteenth century, 348 ff.
- Renaissance, Catholic, 344.  
of religion, the, 283 f.
- Rescue work for children, 325.
- Resurrection, the, 29 ff.
- Reunion, 366.
- Ritualism (cf. Tractarian movement).
- Roman Catholic Church, the—
- apostolic succession, 56, 58 ff., 66, 162 ff.
  - baptism, 160 (cf. Baptism).
  - bishops, 166 ff.  
in England, 363.
  - canon, the, 160 (cf. Canon).
  - confession, 221, 225.
  - confirmation, 219.
  - Cyprian's conception of the, 162 f.
  - Roman Catholic Church, the—  
discipline of, 110 ff., 177, 269, 279.
  - disruption of, 227 ff.
  - Germanized, 173, 180.
  - holy matrimony, 220, 329.
  - indulgences, 170, 240.
  - in England, 363.
  - in Italy, 376.
  - in Spain, 176.
  - Mass, the, 134 ff., 219, 259 f.
  - ordination, 220.
  - papacy (cf. Popes).
  - penance, 67, 117 f., 154, 177, 219.
  - priesthood, 66, 68.
  - reform of, 229 ff.
  - sacraments (cf. Sacraments).
  - state control, 238.
  - St Peter and, 30, 32, 37, 45 f., 59 f., 64 f., 159 ff., 168.
  - (Cf. also Catholic Church.)
- Roman empire—
- alliance of church and state, 85.
  - a political union, 2 ff.
  - Græco-Roman rule, 2 ff.
  - imperial decrees, 72 ff.
  - Judaism, tolerance of, 76.
  - martyrdoms, 73, 78 ff.
  - monotheism, 7, 11, 13 ff., 47, 48.
  - Neoplatonism, 9.
  - persecutions, 71 f., 77 f.
  - polytheism, 6-7, 76.
  - religion and state, 6 ff.
  - roads, 3.
  - sway of, 2 ff.
  - the Jews and the, 14-20.
- Romans, Epistle to the, reference to, 33, 107.
- Romanticism, 319 f.
- Rome—
- and its advantages, 159.
  - burial-place of Peter and Paul, 159.
  - Calixtus, 67, 115, 161 ff.

- Rome—  
 capital of the new state Italy, 335.  
 expansion of Christianity in, 38 ff.  
 gift of Constantine, the, 167.  
 Gregory the Great, 170 f.  
 heir of the ancient world, 170.  
 infallibility of the Pope, 170, 206 ff., 214, 335.  
 legendary scene of St John's persecution, 159.  
 papal legislation, 168.  
 popes, the seal of the, 161 ff., 167.  
 sack of, 143.  
 St Paul in, 38 ff.
- Rugby and its headmaster, Arnold, 370.  
 Temple, 371 f.  
 Ruskin, John, 374.  
 Russia, Nicholas I. of, 334.  
 Jesuits flee to, 302.
- Sacerdotal authority, 360.
- Sacraments—  
 baptism, 60 ff., 127, 132 ff., 160, 173, 216.  
 confirmation, 219 (cf. Bishops).  
 marriage, 220 (cf. Holy Matrimony).  
 Mass, the, 134 ff., 219, 259 f. (Cf. Eucharist, Lord's Supper.)  
 old-time, 138.  
 ordination, 220 (cf. Bishops).  
 penance, 67, 117 f., 154, 177, 219.
- Sacrifice, 135.
- St Bartholomew's day, massacre of, 271.
- Saints, worship of, 218.
- Salt, sacred, 138.
- Salvation Army, the, 270, 375.
- Salzburgers, expulsion of, 302.
- "Sanctio pragmatica" of Bourges, 236.
- Saxons, the, 180, 195.
- Schism, the Forty Years', 234.
- Schleiermacher, Fried., 315, 321 ff.
- Schmalkalden, evangelical alliance at, 258.
- Scholasticism, 149, 208 ff., 290.
- Schwabach articles, the, 260.
- Science, and religion, 342.  
 historical, 330.
- Scotland, Presbyterianism in, 270.
- Seneca and St Paul, 8.
- Serapis, the cult of, 120.
- Sicily, Henry VI. inherits, 202.
- Sisterhoods, 364.
- Slavs, Methodius, apostle of the, 194.
- Social questions, 328, 368, 375.
- Socialism, Christian, 329.
- Society for the History of the Reformation, 342.  
 of Christianity, the, 309-310.  
 of Friends, 284, 285, 356, 374 (cf. Quakers).
- Sohm's *History of Canon Law*, 33.
- "Sophistry," 8.
- Sophists, 93.
- Spaniards and Moors, the, 264.
- "Speaking with tongues," 111.
- Spencer, Herbert, and Positivism, 372 f.
- Speyer, diet of, 258, 276.
- Stanley, Dean, 370 f.
- Strauss' *Life of Jesus*, 332.  
*Der alte und der neue Glaube*, 338.  
*Die Halben und die Ganzen*, 338.
- Summa Theologiæ* of Aquinas, 211 f.
- Superstition, 240, 329.
- Supper, the Last (cf. Eucharist, Lord's Supper, Mass).
- Syncretism, 82, 291.
- Synodal system, development of the, 101.
- Synods, 92, 101, 147, 165, 168, 185, 187, 188, 333.

- Taxation, Roman, 77.  
*Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, the, 112, 129.  
 Technical arts, Germans and, 175.  
 Temple, Archbishop, 371 f.  
 Tennyson, 374.  
 Territorial churches, 172 ff., 344-5.  
   become state churches, 277.  
   revived, 236.  
   (Cf. German territorial churches.)  
 Tertullian, 66, 73 f., 91, 98, 102, 112, 115, 135, 145, 153 f., 160 f., 163, 170.  
 Teutons, ancient, 139 ff.  
*Texte und Untersuchungen*, 45.  
 Theocracy, 188 f.  
 Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths, 178 f.  
 Theodosius the Great and the Nicene orthodoxy, 101, 311.  
 Theologians, first use of the term, 94.  
 Theological leaders, modern, 368.  
   study, the Tractarians and, 361.  
 Theology, 93 ff., 331.  
   Aristotelian, 211.  
   early, 93 ff.  
   natural, 287.  
   reconstruction of, 322.  
 Thessalonians, 1st Epistle to the, reference to, 32.  
 Thirty-nine Articles, the, 361 f.  
   Maurice and, 369.  
   ordination candidates and, 361.  
   Tractarians and, 361 f.  
 Thirty Years' War, the, 271, 276.  
 Timothy, 1st Epistle to, 75.  
 Tractarian movement, the, 282, 330, 348, 358 ff.  
   brotherhoods, 364.  
   cause of, 360.  
 Tractarian movement—  
   methods and objects of, 360 f.  
   Newman and others join Church of Rome, 359, 362.  
   Nicene Creed and, 367 f.  
   persecutions and prosecutions, 365.  
   results of, 363 f.  
   sisterhoods, 364.  
   spiritual and social success of, 364.  
   the Thirty-nine Articles, 361 f.  
   theological study, 361.  
 Tractarians, notable—  
   Keble, 359.  
   Newman, 359, 360, 362, 366.  
   Oakeley, 359.  
   Pusey, 359.  
   Ward, 359.  
*Tracts for the Times*, 360 ff.  
 Trajan's letter to Pliny, 80.  
 Transubstantiation, 213.  
 Trent, Council of, 265 ff.  
 Treves, the Holy Coat of, 329.  
 Trinity, doctrine of the, 98 f., 102, 133, 213 *et passim*.  
*True Christianity*, Arndt's, 290.  
 Tübingen school, the, 35, 45, 331, 340.  
 Uhlhorn cited, 12.  
 Ulpian's collection of rescripts, 72.  
 Ultramontanism, modern, 326, 334, 341.  
 Union, Catholic Journeymen's, the, 329.  
   of the Western Churches ended, 246.  
 Unitarians, 365, 374.  
 Universities, evangelical, 289.  
 University of Berlin, 322.  
   of Göttingen, 295.  
 Utrecht, the "Pope" of, 292.  
 Valerian persecutions, the, 83.  
 Vatican Council, 335.

- Vestments, 260.  
Vicarious sacrifice, the doctrine  
of, 357-8.  
Virginity, 110, 115, 224.  
Visigoths, the, 179.  
Voet, the "Pope" of Utrecht,  
292.  
Voltaire, 295 f., 302.  
Waldenses, the, 243.  
Weimar, Luther - Home near,  
325 f.  
Wernle, 36.  
Wesley, 309, 350 f., 354.  
Wesleyans, the, 356.  
Westcott, New Testament studies  
of, 373.  
Western Church, the, 4, 151 ff.,  
172 ff., 186.  
Empire, the fall of the, 143-4.  
Westminster Abbey, 371.  
Westphalia, peace of, 272.  
Whitefield, 309 f., 350 f., 354.  
Wilfrid, 177-8.  
Wöllner edict, the, 317.  
Wordsworth, 374.  
Worms, Concordat of, 200.  
Luther in, 254.  
Worship, 106 ff., 124 f.  
Württemberg, church of, re-  
organized, 291.  
Wyclif, 244 f., 246.  
Zacharias, Pope, 185.  
Zahn, Th., 45.  
Zinzendorf, 293, 310, 315, 320 f.  
Zürich and the Reformation,  
258.  
Zwingli, 258, 260, 267.  
Zwinglians, the, 258 f.





# A Catalogue

of

## Williams & Norgate's Publications

---

---

### Divisions of the Catalogue

	PAGE
I. THEOLOGY . . . . .	3
II. PHILOSOPHY, PSYCHOLOGY. . . . .	29
III. ORIENTAL LANGUAGES, LITERATURE, AND HISTORY	34
IV. PHILOLOGY, MODERN LANGUAGES . . . . .	39
V. SCIENCE, MEDICINE, CHEMISTRY, ETC. . . . .	45
VI. BIOGRAPHY, ARCHÆOLOGY, LITERATURE, MIS- CELLANEOUS . . . . .	56

*FULL INDEX OVER PAGE*

---

---

London

Williams & Norgate

14 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, W.C.

# INDEX.

- Abyssinia**, *Shihab al Din*, 37.  
**Agricultural Chemical Analysis**, *Wiley*, 55.  
**Alcyonium**, *Liverpool Mar. Biol. C. Mem.*, 48, 49.  
**Americans**, The, *Münsterberg*, 30.  
**Anarchy and Law**, *Brewster*, 29.  
**Anatomy**, *Cunningham Memoirs*, 46.  
     Surgical, of the Horse, 49.  
**Antedon**, *Liverpool Marine Biol. Mem.*, 49.  
**Anthropology**, Prehistoric, *Avebury*, 56; *Engelhardt*, 57.  
     Evolution of Religion, *Farnell*, 12.  
**Anurida**, *Liverpool Marine Biol. Mem.*, 49.  
**Apocalypse**, *Bleek*, 8; *Clark*, 17.  
**Apostles and Apostolic Times**, *Dobschütz*, 4; *Hausrath*, 19; *Weinel*, 4; *Weizsäcker*, 7; *Zeller*, 9.  
     Statutes of, edit. G. Horner, 26.  
**Apostolic Succession**, *Clark*, 17.  
**Arabic Grammar**, *Socin*, 37.  
     Poetry, *Faisullah Bhai*, 35; *Lyll*, 35; *Nöldeke*, 36.  
**Ascidia**, *Liverpool Marine Biol. Mem.*, 48.  
**Assyrian**, Dictionary, *Muss-Arnolt*, 36; *Norris*, 36.  
     Grammar, *Delitzsch*, 34.  
     Language, *Delitzsch*, 34.  
**Assyriology**, *Brown*, 56; *Delitzsch*, 10, 34; *Evans*, 35; *Sayce*, 15; *Schrader*, 9.  
**Astigmatic Tests**, *Pray*, 52; *Snellen*, 54.  
**Astronomy**, *Cunningham Mem.*, V., 46; *Memoirs of Roy. Astronom. Soc.*, 62.  
**Atom**, Study of, *Venable*, 55.  
**Augustine**, St., Confessions of, *Harnack*, 18.  
**Babylonia**, see **Assyriology**.  
**Belief**, Religious, *Upton*, 15.  
**Beneficence**, Negative and Positive, *Spencer*, Principles of Ethics, II., 31.  
**Bible**, 16.  
     See also **Testament**.  
     Beliefs about, *Savage*, 25.  
     *Hebrew Texts*, 19.  
     History of Text, *Weir*, 27.  
     Plants, *Henslow*, 19.  
     Problems, *Cheyne*, 11.  
**Bibliography**, *Bibliographical Register*, 56.  
**Biology**, *Bastian*, 45; *Liverpool Marine Biol. Mem.*, 48, 49; *Spencer*, 31.  
**Botany**, *Jour. of the Linnean Soc.*, 48.  
**Brain**, *Cunningham Mem.*, VII., 46.  
**Buddha**, **Buddhism**, *Dauids*, 14; *Hardy*, 35; *Oldenberg*, 36.  
**Calculus**, *Harnack*, 47.  
**Canons of Athanasius**, *Text & Trans. Soc.*, 38.  
**Cardium**, *Liverpool Marine Biol. Mem.*, 48.  
**Celtic**, see also **Irish**.  
     *Sullivan*, 42.  
     Heathendom, *Rhys*, 15.  
**Ceremonial Institutions**, *Spencer*, Princ. of Sociology, II., 31.  
**Chaldee**, Grammar, *Turpie*, 38.  
     Lexicon, *Fuerst*, 35.  
**Chemistry**, *Van't Hoff*, 47; *Hart*, 47; *Noyes Mulliken*, 51; *Venable*, 55.  
**Chemist's Pocket Manual**, 49.  
**Christ**, Early Christian Conception of, *Pfleiderer*, 11, 23.  
     Life of, *Keim*, 8.  
     No Product of Evolution, *Henslow*, 19.  
     Study of, *Robinson*, 24.  
     Teaching of, *Harnack*, 6, 11.  
     The Universal, *Beard*, 16.  
**Christianity**, Evolution of, *Gill*, 18.  
     Expansion of, *Harnack*, 4.  
     History of, *Baur*, 8; *Dobschütz*, 4; *Harnack*, 6, 11, 18; *Hausrath*, 8, 19; *Johnson-Wernle*, 4.  
     in Talmud, *Herford*, 19.  
     Liberal, *Réville*, 10.  
     Primitive, *Pfleiderer*, 3, 23.  
     Simplest Form of, *Drummond*, 14.  
     What is? *Harnack*, 6, 11.  
**Church**, Catholic, *Renan*, 14.  
     Catholic, A Free, 26.  
     Christian, *Baur*, 8; *Clark*, 17; *Dobschütz-Hatch*, 14; *Wernle*, 4.  
     Christian, Sacerdotal Celibacy in, 21.  
     Coming, *Hunter*, 20.  
     History of, *von Schubert*, 3, 25.  
**Codex Palatino-Vaticanus**, *Todd Lect.* III., 43.  
**Codium**, *Liverpool Marine Biol. Mem.*, 49.  
**Communion of Christian with God**, *Herrmann*.  
**Comte**, *Spencer*, 32.  
**Constellations**, Primitive, *Brown*, 56.  
**Creed**, *Christian*, 16.  
**Crown Theological Library**, 10.  
**Cuneiform**, Inscriptions, *Schrader*, 9.  
**Daniel and His Prophecies**, *C. H. H. Wright* and its Critics, *C. H. H. Wright*, 28.  
**Danish Dictionary**, *Rosing*, 42.  
**Darwinism**, *Schurman*, 30.  
**Denmark**, *Engelhardt*, 57.  
**Doctrine and Principle**, *Beeby*, 16.  
**Dogma**, History of, *Harnack*, 5.  
     of Virgin Birth, *Lobstein*, 10.  
**Domestic Institutions**, *Spencer*, Princ. Sociology, I., 31.  
**Duck Tribes**, Morphology of, *Cunningham Mem.*, VI., 46.  
**Dutch**, Cape, *Oordt*, 42; *Werner*, 43.  
**Dynamics**, *Cunningham Mem.*, IV., 46.  
     Chemical, *Van't Hoff*, 47.  
**Ecclesiastes**, *Taylor*, 26.  
**Ecclesiastical Institutions**, *Spencer*, Princ. Sociology, III., 31.  
     of Holland, *Wicksteed*, 27.  
**Echinus**, *Liverpool Marine Biol. Mem.*, 4.  
**Economy**, Political, *Mackenzie*, 29.  
**Education**, *Herbert*, 57; *Lodge*, 41; *Spencer Hagemann*, 40.  
**Educational Works**, see **Special Catalogue**.

INDEX—Continued.

- gypt, Religion of, *Renouf*, 15.  
 yptian Grammar, *Erman*, 34.  
 lectric Furnace. The, *Moisson*, 51.  
 electrolytic Laboratories, Arrangements of, 51.  
 eginneering Chemistry, *Stillman*, 54.  
 ooch, Book of, *Gill*, 18.  
 pidemiology, *Trans. of Epidemiolog. Soc.*, 55.  
 izootic Lymphangitis, Treatise on, *Pallin*, 51.  
 hics, Early Christian, 25.  
 and Religion, *Martineau*, 22.  
 Data of, *Spencer*, Principles of E., I., 31.  
 Individualism and Collectivism, 30.  
 Induction of, *Spencer*, Principles of E., I., 31.  
 Kantian, *Schurman*, 30.  
 of Evolution, *Schurman*, 30.  
 of Individual Life, *Spencer*, Princ. of E., I., 31.  
 of Reason, *Laurie*, 29.  
 Principles of, *Spencer*, 31.  
 iopic, Grammar, 34.  
 nology, *Cunningham Mems.*, X., 46.  
 olution, *Spencer*, 31, 32.  
 of the Idea of God, *D'Alviella*, 14.  
 of Religious Thought, *D'Alviella*, 15.  
 odus, *Hoerning*, 20.  
 ekiel, *Mosheh ben Shesheth*, 22.  
 ith, *Herrmann*, 11; *Rix*, 24; *Wimmer*, 27.  
 sheries, British, *Johnstone*, 47.  
 nders Petrie Papyri, *Cunningham Mems.*,  
 VIII., IX., 46.  
 ora of Edinburgh, *Sonntag*, 54.  
 ench, *Boëlle*, 40; *Delbos*, 40; *Eugène*, 40;  
*Hugo*, 41, 42; *Roget*, 42; also Special  
 Education Catalogue.  
 Literature, *Roget*, 42.  
 Novels, *Army Series*, 39.  
 mmarus, *Liverpool Marine Biol. Mems.*, 49.  
 nesis, *Hebrew Texts*, 19, 35; *Wright, C. H. H.*, 28.  
 ography, Ancient, *Kiepert*, 58.  
 ometry, Analytical, Elements of, 47.  
 rman Literature, *Nibelungenlied*, 41; *Phillipps*,  
 42.  
 Novels, *Army Series*, 39.  
 many, *Marcks*, 58.  
 l, Idea of, *D'Alviella*, 14.  
 pel, Fourth, *Drummond*, 17; *Taylor*, 26.  
 Social, *Harnack and Herrmann*, 13, 19.  
 pels, Old and New Certainty, *Robinson*, 24.  
 ek, Modern, *Zompoldes*, 44.  
 nnastics, Medical, *Schreber*, 53.  
 row, Biblical, *Kennedy*, 35.  
 anguage, *Delitzsch*, 34.  
 exicon, *Fuerst*, 35.  
 New School of Poets, *Albrecht*, 36.  
 riptures, *Sharpe*, 25.  
 tory, *Peters*, 23.  
 ynonyms, *Kennedy*, 35.  
 ext of O. T., *Weir*, 27.  
 exts, 19, 35.  
 ews, History of, *Kittel*, 6; *Peters*, 11;  
*Sharpe*, 25.  
 ews. Religion of, *Kuenen*, 9; *Montefiore*, 14.  
 erogenesis, *Bastian*, 45.  
 bert Lectures, 14, 15.  
 Horse, Life-size Models of, 48.  
 Hygiene: Practical, Handbook of, 45.  
 Hymns, *Jones*, 20.  
 Icelandic, *Lilja*, 41; *Viga Glums Saga*, 43.  
 Dictionary, *Zoega*, 44.  
 Grammar, *Bayldon*, 39.  
 Individualism, *Spencer*, Man v. State, 32.  
 Infinitesimals and Limits, 47.  
 Irish, *Hogan*, 40; *Leabhar Breac*, 41; *Leabhar*  
*na H-Uidhri*, 41; *O'Grady*, 42; *Todd*  
*Lectures*, 42; *Yellow Book of Lecan*, 44  
 Isaiah, *Hebrew Texts*, 19, 35.  
 Israel, History of, *Kittel*, 6; *Peters*, 23; *Sharpe*, 25.  
 Religion of, *Kuenen*, 9.  
 in Egypt, *Wright, C. H. H.*, 28.  
 Jeremiah, *Mosheh ben Shesheth*, 22.  
 Jesus, *Keim*, 8.  
 The Real, *Vickers*, 27.  
 Times of, *Hausrath*, 8.  
 See also Christ.  
 Job, Book of, *Ewald*, 8; *Hebrew Text*, 19, 35;  
*Wright, C. H. H.*, 28.  
 Rabbinical Comment. on, *Text & Trans. Soc.* 38  
 Justice, *Spencer*, Princ. of Ethics, II., 31, 32.  
 Kant, *Schurman*, 30.  
 Kindergarten, *Goldammer*, 57.  
 Knowledge, Evolution of, *Perrin*, 23, 30.  
 Labour, *Harrison*, 57; *Schloss*, 59; *Vynne*, 60  
 Leabhar Breac, 41; *Hogan*, 40.  
 Life and Matter, *Lodge*, 22.  
 Ligia, *Liverpool Marine Biol. Mems.*, 49  
 Liverpool, History of, *Muir*, 58.  
 Lives of the Saints, *Hogan*, 40.  
 Logarithms, *Sang*, 53; *Schroen*, 53; *Vega*, 55.  
 London Library Catalogue, 57.  
 Lumbar Curve, *Cunningham Mems.*, II., 46.  
 Mahabharata, *Sørensen*, 37.  
 Malaria, *Annett*, 45; *Boyce*, 45; *Dutton*, 46;  
*Mems. of Liverpool School of Tropical*  
*Medicine*, 49; *Ross*, 52; *Stephens*, 54.  
 Maori, Dictionary, *Williams*, 43.  
 Manual, *Maori*, 41.  
 Materialism, *Martineau*, 22.  
 Mathematics, *Harnack*, 47.  
 See also Logarithms.  
 Mediaeval Thought, *Poole*, 23.  
 Mesca Ulad, *Todd Lectures*, I., 42.  
 Metallic Objects, Productions of, 52.  
 Metaphysics, *Laurie*, 29.  
 Mexico, Religions of, *Réville*, 15.  
 Micah, Book of, *Taylor*, 26.  
 Microscopy, *Journal of the Roy. Micro. Soc.*, 48;  
*Journal of the Quirkett Micro. Club*, 48.  
 Midrash, Christianity in, *Herford*, 19.  
 Molecular Weights, Methods of Determining, 45.  
 Monasticism, *Harnack*, 18.  
 Moorhouse Lectures, 22.  
 Mosquitoes, *Mems. of Liverpool School of Trop.*  
*Medicine*, 50.  
 Municipal Government, A History of, in Liver-  
 pool, 59.  
 Mythology, Greek, *Brown*, 56.  
 Northern, *Stephens*, 59.

INDEX—Continued.

- National Idealism and a State Church, 17.  
 Naturalism and Religion, Otto, 12.  
 Nautical Terms, *Delbos*, 40.  
 Nennius, The Irish, *Hogan*, 40.  
 New Guinea, *Cunningham Mems.*, X., 40.  
 Newman, Mystery of, 16.  
 New Testament Times, *Hausrath*, 8, 19.  
 Norwegian Dictionary, *Rosing*, 42.  
 Ophthalmic Tests, *Pray*, 52; *Snellen*, 54.  
 Optical Convention, Proceedings of, 52.  
 Ores, Methods for the Analysis of, 52.  
 Organic Analysis, Elementary, 45.  
 Origins, Christian, *Johnson*, 20.  
     of Religion, *Hibbert Lectures*, 14, 15.  
 Pali, *Dipavamsa*, 34; *Milanda Panho*, 36;  
     *Vinaya Pitakam*, 38.  
     Handbook, *Frankfurter*, 35.  
     Miscellany, 36.  
 Pathology, Inflammation Idea in, *Ransom*, 52.  
 Paul, St., *Baur*, 8; *Pfleiderer*, 9; *Weinel*, 4.  
 Periodic Law, *Venable*, 55.  
 Persian, *Avesti Pahlavi*, 34.  
     Grammar, *Platts*, 37.  
 Peru, Religions of, *Réville*, 15.  
 Philo Judæus, *Drummond*, 29.  
 Philosophy, 29.  
     and Experience, *Hodgson*, 29.  
     Jewish Alexandrian, *Drummond*, 29.  
     of Religion, *Pfleiderer*, 9.  
     Reorganisation of, *Hodgson*, 29.  
     Religion of, *Perrin*, 23.  
     Synthetic, *Collins*, 29; *Spencer*, 31.  
 Political Institutions, *Spencer*, Princ. of Sociology, II., 31.  
 Portland Cement, *Meade*, 49.  
 Pottery, *Sege's*, Writings on, 53.  
 Prayers, *Common Prayer*, 17; *Jones*, 21; *Personal*, 23; *Sadler*, 25; *Ten Services*, 26.  
 Prehistoric Man, *Avebury*, 56; *Engelhardt*, 57.  
 Printing at Brescia, *Peddie*, 59.  
 Professional Institutions, *Spencer*, Princ. of Sociology, III., 31.  
 Profit-sharing, *Schloss*, 59.  
 Prophets of O.T., *Ewald*, 8.  
 Protestant Faith, *Herrmann*, 12; *Réville*, 11.  
 Psalms, *Hebrew Texts*, 19, 35.  
     and Canticles, *Ten Services*, 26.  
     Commentary, *Ewald*, 8.  
 Psychology, *Scripture*, 30; *Wundt*, 33.  
     of Belief, *Pikler*, 30.  
     Principles of, *Spencer*, 31.  
 Reconciliation, *Henslow*, 19.  
 Reformation, *Beard*, 14.  
 Religion, Child and, 11.  
     History of, *Kuenen*, 9, 14; *Réville*, 9, 15.  
     and Naturalism, *Otto*, 12.  
     of Philosophy, *Perrin*, 23.  
     Philosophy of, *Pfleiderer*, 9.  
     Struggle for Light, *Winnmer*, 10.  
     See also Christianity, History of.  
 Religions, National and Universal, *Kuenen*, 21.  
     of Authority, *Sabatier*, 4.  
 Resurrection, *Lake*, 13; *Macan*, 22; *Marchant*, 22.  
 Reviews and Periodical Publications, 61.  
 Rigveda, *Wallis*, 38.  
 Rome, *Renan*, 14.  
 Runes, *Stephens*, 59.  
 Ruth, *Wright*, C. H. H., 28.  
 Sanitation, in Cape Coast Town, *Taylor*, 54.  
     in Para, *Notes*, 51.  
 Sanscrit, *Abhidhanaratnamala*, 34; *Sörensén*, 37.  
 Sermons, *Beard*, 16; *Broadbent*, 16.  
     Addresses, and Essays, 24.  
 Services, *Common Prayer*, 17; *Jones*, 21; *Ten Services*, 26.  
 Silva Gadelica, *O'Grady*, 42.  
 Social Dynamics, *Mackenzie*, 29.  
     Statics, *Spencer*, 32.  
 Sociology, Descriptive, *Spencer*, 32.  
     Principles of, *Spencer*, 31.  
     Study of, *Spencer*, 32.  
 Soils and Fertilisers, 54.  
 Solomon, Song of, *Réville*, 24.  
 South Place Ethical Society, *Conway*, 17.  
 Spanish Dictionary, *Velasquez*, 43.  
 Spinal Cord, *Bruce*, 46.  
 Sternum, *Paterson*, 51.  
 Storms, *Piddington*, 52.  
 Sun Heat, *Cunningham Mems.*, III., 46.  
 Surgery, System of, *von Bergmann*, 45.  
 Syriac, *Bernstein*, 34; *Dietrich*, 34; *Nöldeke*, 36.  
 Taal, Afrikander, *Oordt*, 42; *Werner*, 43.  
 Talmud, Christianity in, *Herford*, 19.  
 Tennyson, *Weld*, 60.  
 Tent and Testament, *Rix*, 24.  
 Testament, New, Apologetic of, 13.  
     Books of, *Von Soden*, 26.  
     Commentary, *Protestant Commentary*, 9.  
     Luke the Physician, 13, 18.  
     Textual Criticism, *Nestle*, 7.  
     Times, *Hausrath*, 8, 19.  
     See also Gospels.  
 Testament, Old, Cuneiform Inscriptions, *Schrader*, 9.  
     Introduction to the Canonical Books of, 3, 1.  
     Literature of, *Kautzsch*, 21.  
     Religion of, *Marti*, 13, 22.  
 Test Types, *Pray*, 52; *Snellen*, 54.  
 Theism, *Voysey*, 27.  
 Theological Translation Library, 3.  
 Theology, History of, *Pfleiderer*, 9.  
     New, Sermons, *R. J. Campbell*, 16.  
 Thermometer, History of, 45.  
 Trypanosomiasis, *Dutton*, 47.  
 Urine Analysis, Text-book of, 49.  
 Virgil, *Henry*, 57.  
 Virgin Birth, *Lobstein*, 10.  
 Weissmann, *Spencer*, 32.  
 Woman's Labour, *Englishwoman's Review*, *Harrison*, 57; *Vynne*, 59.  
     Suffrage, *Blackburn*, 56.  
 Yellow Fever, *Durham*, 50.  
 Zoology, *Journal of the Linnean Soc.*, 48; *London Pool Marine Biology Comm. Mems.*, 48.













BW903 .S384  
Outlines of church history,

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00015 8065